3.27.24.

LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PRINCETON. N. J.

PRESENTED BY

Rev. Leon Arpee.

BV 4626 .S5 1875
Shipley, Orby, 1832-1916.
A theory about sin

A THEORY ABOUT SIN.

The Right of Translation and Reproduction is Reserved.

A THEORY ABOUT SIN

IN RELATION TO

SOME FACTS OF DAILY LIFE

LENT LECTURES

ON THE SEVEN DEADLY SINS

BY

REV. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A.

London

MACMILLAN AND CO.

1875

TO SOME

AMONGST THE FAITHFUL,

BOTH PRIESTS AND PEOPLE,

OF

S. MARY MAGDALENE'S, PADDINGTON,

S. ALBAN'S, HOLBORN,

CHRIST'S CHURCH, CLAPHAM,

S. PAUL'S, BRIGHTON,

WHO HEARD THESE LECTURES

AND ASKED TO READ THEM,

THEY ARE DEDICATED

A. M. D. G.

"*Every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then, when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin.*" S. JAMES I. 14, 15.

"*All the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.*" GALATIANS V. 14.

Preface.

"A Theory about Sin" owes its completion to two causes.

It had long been entertained by the writer, that the various developments of sin might all be referred for their existence to different forms of selfishness. Many efforts were made by him to reduce to a system the thoughts which either suggested or arose from this conception. These efforts, however, proved unsatisfactory when sufficiently elaborated to become capable of systematic arrangement. Some element in the mental problem was wanting.

A winter spent in Florence in 1871-72 gave further opportunity for considering the subject of sin in relation to self. This consideration was assisted by the timely gift from the publisher of a book then lately issued from the press entitled, "A Shadow of Dante."[1] This book supplied a clue—simple enough in principle and self-evident when stated—to the theory sought after, in order to systematise

[1] "A Shadow of Dante: Being an Essay towards studying Himself, his World, and his Pilgrimage." By Maria Francesca Rossetti. Rivingtons, 3rd Ed. 1874.

previous thought. It was afforded by the accomplished author's commentary on the poet's "Pilgrimage through Purgatory." Her annotations on the Vision recalled the truth, till then carelessly overlooked in this connection, that though human selfishness may be the immediate cause of human sin, yet that selfishness itself springs from an earlier source. "In every creature," writes the author of the "Shadow," "the fundamental principle of action is Love." This, therefore, may be taken to be the wanting element of the problem in which self and sin were the terms earlier ascertained. Love is the origin of selfishness; and self is the source of sin. On these two axioms of the spiritual life have been founded "a theory about sin" which is illustrated in the following lectures.

It is needless to indicate the steps that led from these premises to the conclusions which form the subject matter of the lectures. It had been needless even to refer to the passage which suggested their line of thought, were it not that it is a pleasure to avow the amount of brain-help one has received from another, as well as a duty to prevent that other from being made responsible for results for which oneself only is answerable. To acknowledge my indebtedness to the talented student of Dante, who since the publication of her valuable "Essay towards studying himself and his pilgrimage" may be claimed as a fellow-worker in the religious life, is a gratification. But the poet's words, as explained by one of his latest commentators, must not be held accountable for the use which is made of them as hereafter developed. Their position in the "theory about sin"

practically treated in the present volume may be seen by referring to the "Analysis of the seven deadly sins," and the "Summary of the relations between love and self and sin," which follow the preface.

"A Theory about Sin" lays claim to no originality in the conception and treatment of either of the two elementary truths of which it is composed. The task which I proposed to fulfil was, to combine these two elements in a single theory, and to illustrate it from the sins and temptations of every-day life. It is to the latter part of the attempt that I invite criticism—how we, men and women of the present day, may be forewarned by the examples given or cases suggested to escape the attacks of the sevenfold enemy of our soul. The theory itself is almost beyond criticism. When once stated, its chief value consists in the foundation laid for further practical considerations. These I have endeavoured to make as plain as I had power to make them, and as full as was consistent with the time or space placed at my disposal. Here, not less than in discussing the theory, I pretend to no originality. Where it has been possible, I have freely availed myself of the labours of earlier writers, masters of the spiritual life: and the main object of the lectures is to adapt their wisdom to the common-place events of our own every-day existence.

Since the lectures were first delivered, I have become conscious that one factor of the mental product—in regard to self—has been discussed by writers of the present day. Of course, one factor also—in regard to love—has been con-

sidered in former times. But I have not yet discovered both the factors treated together as a whole. It may prove to be of interest, and will be of value, to compare the line of thought in the following pages with the words of two authors of widely different sympathies, which touch upon each division of the theory respectively. The relation of self to sin may be read in the eloquent and true words of a late Bampton Lecturer. The relation between love and self is stated by a mystic writer of the fifteenth century.

I. In reply to the question, What is it which makes the exercise of volition good or evil morally? Mr. I. Gregory Smith answers thus: "The whole universe, real or phenomenal, if considered from the standpoint at which we have arrived, of each man's personality, resolves itself for him into self and non-self; and the faculties, mental and moral, already spoken of are, through the instrumentality of sense, the media of attraction or repulsion between the world without and the smaller world of each individual existence. Here, then, we have a principle, wide as the range of our conceptions, simple as all first principles are, determining the moral character of all that we do, say, or feel. When the individual, using his faculties as a prehensile instrument, draws the outer world to himself, there—in one shape or another, in a greater or less degree, disguise it, deny it as we may—there is selfishness. When the individual, by the same media of communication, lets himself be transported out of himself, and drawn to the world without, there is the opposite of selfish-

ness, call it what you please, self-devotion, self-renunciation, unselfish love, charity. . . . Things and persons. In these words there is a practical touchstone for us and our motives. The ideally vicious man recognises no personality but his own. Outside himself all is impersonal. Others exist only as things for his pleasure or convenience. On the other hand, the unselfish see everywhere in the world around them the claims, not to be slighted, of beings like themselves. Self seems as nothing in presence of all these manifold demands on their sympathy. Far from regarding their fellows as immaterial chattels, the world to them teems with the sacredness of life. . . . They feel" (he adds, quoting Mr. Mill's "Address at S. Andrews"), "'the miserable smallness of self, the poorness and insignificance of human life, if it is all to be spent in making things comfortable for ourselves and our kin, in raising ourselves and them one step higher on the social ladder.'"

This is no mere theory, continues Mr. I. Gregory Smith: "Take any statute book, from the Sinaitic Decalogue to the latest codification of modern legislators. The things forbidden —murder, theft, adultery, and their cognates—spring from self disregarding the rights of other personalities, and into this are resoluble. Pass from overt acts to the virtues and vices of moralists—cruelty, lust, deceit; what are these but self caring only for self, and closing its eyes to the existence of others as persons. Or take those two widely-divergent, mutually-abhorrent affections, which we . . . class together under the homonym of love—(love) desecrating the highest attribute of humanity, the love which is indeed hatred . . .

and the self-immolating love . . . which 'holds its life but as a pawn' for others . . . Are we not justified in saying, that selfishness and unselfishness, the bane and the antidote, grow side by side at the very root of all within us which we term good and evil?"

But, it must be kept in mind, says the lecturer in noble words which conclude this part of his subject, "this self-abnegation for the sake of others is no suicidal frenzy, no self-annihilation, no absorption of self into the soul of the universe. For what in that case would be left for love to live for, to energise upon? Obviously, unless the result is to be an utter vacuity of inanition, each one is bound to observe the law of self-preservation for this very reason, that he may live for others; is bound to look to his own interests, that he may live for others more effectively. Nor is this limitation incompatible with the purest disinterestedness. The motive makes all the difference. If a man saves, that he may have to give to those who need; or economises health and strength, that he may work longer for others; or studies self-culture, that he may better play his part in life's drama . . . he will do more good to others in the end, than by reckless almsgiving, or by defiance of hygienic laws, or by shuffling through his part on life's stage, because it is his own. . . . Moralists have spoken of inordinacy as that which vitiates affections innocent otherwise, or even laudable. But it is not the amount of energy bestowed which makes them wrong, it is the motive which lurks at their core. The highest ideal which we can imagine of goodness and greatness is surely this, entire self-devotion for the good of others as the motive power, with wise regard

to every consideration which can in any way be made to subserve this end." [1]

II. The will is the power, says his biographer, "which Goch regards as chiefly determining the bent of man's spiritual life, whether towards Divine things, or to evil, which is their contrary. . . . The will, however, is based upon another power, which influences its motions. It has its root in the affections, and the heart. Love is the primal and ultimate power in man, and if the tendency of his being outwardly is determined by the will, so, inwardly, in its centre, the will receives in turn its bent and force from love. This idea is expressed by Goch in many ways, and in connection with a great variety of subjects. What wings are to a bird, he says in his Dialogues, 'love is to us. They seem to add to the weight of the body: in reality, however, they elevate it into the air. In like manner the yoke of love, when imposed upon our sensuous nature, not only does not weigh it down, but lifts the spirit with the senses to heavenly things. . . . Take from them their wings, and you take from birds the power of flying. Even so, separate love from the will, and the will is made incapable of every act that transcends nature. . . . Love and the will are no doubt said to be the two factors which together constitute the impelling cause to a mode of action above nature. Love, however, is by far the greater of the two, partly because it inclines the will to act above nature, and partly because, with-

[1] "Bampton Lectures: Characteristics of Christian Morality." By the Rev. I. Gregory Smith. Parker. 1873. (II. Vice is selfishness: Virtue is unselfishness, pp. 22–26.)

out love, the will is incompetent . . . [but] the will, when imbued with love, co-operates with it as a free cause, and in place of being constrained by it, is rather exalted to a higher degree of liberty and power. . . . As the Gospel law is the law of love, and the law of love is the law of liberty, it follows that whosoever binds himself to the observance of the Gospel, devotes himself to the exercise of Divine love. . . . This exercise of Divine love does not diminish the freedom of the human will, but perfects it; because whatsoever is done from love is most of all considered free." [1]

"A Theory about Sin" is concerned with only a small range in a wide field of theological inquiry. Into the interesting and suggestive questions of the nature, characteristics, and results of sin it has not entered. What is sin? Why is sin sinful? When do we commit sin? Whence have we the power to sin? Against whom do we sin? How is sin punished? How is sin forgiven? and the foundation of all, Is sin an objective reality, or is it a vague, subjective consciousness of a past fact?—these questions have not been entertained in the present volume. They have been assumed in the sense in which I understand the Church to have answered them. They would make suitable topics for inquiry in connection with the remedies for the suppression and cure

[1] "Life of John [Pupper] of Goch," by C. Ullmann. Clark's Foreign Theological Library, N. S. vol. vi. Goch was born in the little town in the Duchy of Cleves from which he takes his title, about the beginning of the fifteenth century, and was probably head of one of the houses of the Brethren of the Common Lot He died in 1475

of the seven deadly sins; but they are too large for discussion in this book.

It appears only necessary to say that in the following lectures certain first principles with reference to sin are accepted as axiomatic in the spiritual life of Catholics: that sin is an objective reality in the soul, apart from all subjective sensation in regard to it, apart from all we feel about it, or think about it, or care about it: that sin once committed remains in the soul, until it is definitely and authoritatively removed, whether or not it be remembered, whether or not it be repented: that sin in the soul is not removed simply because we are sorry for it, or because we have forgotten it, willingly or otherwise, or because we have ceased to commit it, or because since its commission we have tried to undo it or have done good works either of reparation or of amendment: that the covenanted method of forgiveness in the Christian Church, for post-baptismal, deadly sin is through the Sacrament of Penance—a method to which, of course, GOD'S infinite mercy is not confined, but to which pardon is absolutely pledged, and through which alone man can be positively assured that his sin is absolved.

ORBY SHIPLEY.

20, DENMARK TERRACE, BRIGHTON.
Michaelmas, A.D. 1874.

Analysis of the

I. Sins of

I. The Distorter of Love — Loves evil or ill to those whom he should love as himself, that is his Neighbour:

- i. If, for his own exaltation, he desires another's depression
- ii. If, esteeming his own power to be lessened, he desires another's destitution
- iii. If, because of evil done to himself, he desires another's injury

II. Sin of

II. The Defaulter in Love — Loves less than he might love the Highest Good, that is God:

- iv. And striving after it all too slackly

III. Sins of

III. The Exceeder in Love — Loves more than he ought to love some Lower Good, that is created things:

- v. If this be money or money's worth
- vi. If this be food or drink
- vii. If this be sensual gratification or enjoyment

Seven Deadly Sins.

Love Distorted.

A man sins by
- *a.* Pride;
- *b.* Envy;
- *c.* Anger;

Deadly Sins which may be defined as

1. An inordinate belief in, desire of, and love for self-excellence, for the love only of self.
2. An inordinate and selfish uneasiness of mind at another's good, and action which ensues from such want of peace.
3. An inordinate and selfish love of and desire for revenge.

Love Deficient.

A man sins by
- *d.* Sloth;

Deadly Sin which may be defined as

4. The sin of omission, which selfishly feels inordinate indisposition of soul towards the love of God, and all that flows from it.

Love Excessive.

A man sins by
- *e.* Avarice;
- *f.* Gluttony;
- *g.* Lust;

Deadly Sins which may be defined as

5. An inordinate and selfish love of money which we actually possess, or of which we are not actually in possession.
6. An inordinate and selfish desire for the sensual pleasure which arises from eating and drinking.
7. An inordinate love for and desire of that form of personal gratification which is termed sensuality.

Summary of the Relations between Love and Self and Sin.

I. Love is the Motive Principle of all Human Action.

Love is divisible into
- I. Perfect or divine love, which includes the
  - 1. Love of God, as God;
  - 2. Love of God's image, for God's sake;
  - 3. Love of created things, in relation to God.
- II. Imperfect or human love, which centres in the
  - 4. Love of self.

II. Self is the Source and Origin of all Human Sin.

Love of self, or imperfect love, may take three forms:
- I. Of loving evil or ill, in love distorted;
- II. Of loving too little, in love deficient;
- III. Of loving over-much, in love excessive.

III. Deadly Sin is the Development of Human Selfishness.

Human selfishness may be developed into
- I. Love distorted, which is evidenced by 1. Pride; 2. Envy; 3. Anger:
- II. Love deficient, which is evidenced by 4. Sloth:
- III. Love excessive, which is evidenced by 5. Avarice; 6. Gluttony; 7. Lust.

IV. Divine Love is the Antidote to Human Selfishness.

Human selfishness may be conquered, in the form
- I. Of Love distorted, by 1. Humility; 2. Brotherly Love; 3. Meekness:
- II. Of Love deficient, by 4. Charity:
- III. Of Love excessive, by 5. Liberality; 6. Temperance; 7. Purity.

Lectures and their Subjects.

PART I.—SINS OF LOVE DISTORTED.

LECTURE ONE.

PAGE

SOME PRIMARY RELATIONS BETWEEN LOVE AND SELF AND SIN 3

LECTURE TWO.

OF THE DEADLY SIN OF PRIDE 30

LECTURE THREE.

OF THE DEADLY SIN OF ENVY 61

LECTURE FOUR.

OF THE DEADLY SIN OF ANGER 94

PART II.—THE SIN OF LOVE DEFECTIVE.

LECTURE FIVE.

FURTHER PRIMARY RELATIONS BETWEEN LOVE AND SELF AND SIN 127

LECTURE SIX.

PAGE

OF THE DEADLY SIN OF SLOTH 154

PART III.—SINS OF LOVE EXCESSIVE.

LECTURE SEVEN.

SOME SECONDARY QUESTIONS IN THE RELATIONS BETWEEN LOVE AND SELF AND SIN 187

LECTURE EIGHT.

OF THE DEADLY SIN OF AVARICE 215

LECTURE NINE.

OF THE DEADLY SIN OF GLUTTONY 249

LECTURE TEN.

OF THE DEADLY SIN OF LUST 280

LECTURE ELEVEN.

FINAL QUESTIONS IN THE RELATIONS BETWEEN LOVE AND SELF AND SIN 315

ERRATUM.

Page 36, line 6: *for* "feelings" *read* "failings."

LECTURES ON THE DEADLY SINS.

PART I.

SINS OF LOVE DISTORTED.

PART I.

SINS OF LOVE DISTORTED.

LECTURE ONE.

SOME PRIMARY RELATIONS BETWEEN LOVE AND SELF AND SIN.

LECTURES TWO, THREE, AND FOUR.

OF THE DEADLY SINS OF PRIDE, ENVY, AND ANGER.

A Theory about Sin.

PART I.

SINS OF LOVE DISTORTED

LECTURE ONE.

SOME PRIMARY RELATIONS BETWEEN LOVE AND SELF AND SIN:

I. LOVE THE PRINCIPLE OF HUMAN ACTION; II. SELF THE SOURCE OF HUMAN SIN.

"*God is Love: and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him.*" 1 S. John iv. 16.

I.

LOVE is the principle of all human action—love perfect or wanting in perfection. Whether it be the love of God, or the love of man, or the love of created things, or the love of self—love is the motive principle of all human action. The love of God, as God; the love of God's image, for His sake; the love of His creation, in regard to God—these are three several and distinct efforts of love. They are developments of love perfect and divine. The last of this fourfold and

exhaustive division of the mainspring of active life, is the love of self. The love of self for one's own self chiefly, and the love of the creature for the creature's sake alone, or in relation only to self—this is the personation of love imperfect and human. Thus, selfishness and love divine are antagonistic forces which divide between them the cause of human action, are opposite poles towards which human motives point.

But, perfect love, we are told by the Apostle, is the fulfilling of the law; and the transgression of the law, the result of imperfect love, is sin. If then self-sacrifice may be considered to be the foundation of holiness of life, selfishness, or the love of self, so far as the will of man is concerned, may be treated as the source and origin of sin. These, my Brethren, are truths which I desire to enforce upon you at the outset of our lectures on the relations between love and self and sin.

But, there are other truths to which I would also bespeak your attention. They are almost a consequence of the former. Since love is the motive principle of human action, and self is the origin and source of human sin, the capital sins, which we are about to consider, are developments only of selfishness, are the results of imperfect love. Again, as self is the poison which destroys the virtue of human action, so, in all questions of motive, the antidote which counteracts the poison, is love. And

imperfect love, or the love of self, may take at least three forms. It may take the form of loving ill or evil, in love distorted. It may take the form of loving too little, in love defective. It may take the form of loving over much, in love excessive. In each of these forms selfishness, or imperfect love, can only be counteracted by love which is abandonment of self, by love which is self-sacrifice. And to such forms in action are given the name of the capital or root, of mortal or deadly sins. Perfect love, on the other hand, in union with our Divine Head, is the gift or grace, by which, at its source, the guilty principle of sin may be cleansed; by which, in its result, the guilty issue of sin may be atoned; by which, at any intermediate stage, the guilty development of sin may be prevented. For self-love can only be subdued by self-abnegation; imperfect and human love can only be cancelled by love which is divine and perfect. In other words, selfishness, in the heart of a Catholic aiming at holiness of life, must be kept in check by self-forgetfulness; the love of the creature must give place to the love of GOD.

These mutually dependent truths

I. That love is the motive principle of all human action:

II. That self is the source and origin of all human sin:

III. That the seven deadly sins are the development of selfishness, and the result of imperfect love: and

IV. That love perfect and divine is the antidote to the poison of self-love:

these truths, in the relation between love and self and sin, are, to a Christian man, elementary. They are elementary to the extent of being often forgotten or overlooked, of being often denied or ignored. They are forgotten, in learning our duty towards GOD. They are overlooked, in ordering our dealings with man. They are denied, in diminishing our dependence upon outward things. They are ignored, in opposing the supremacy of our inner self. Yet, they tend to explain many difficulties when cause and effect become confused; between the motive instigating, the agent acting, the being influenced, and the result attained, in the battle of Christian life. Their existence, however, will be assumed, even if not declared, in all that I am able, GOD helping me, to place before you on the subject of the deadly sins. We will shortly consider them one by one: and will turn at once to the examination of the first of these four propositions, namely

That love is the motive principle of all human action.

II.

If we examine the various results of human action, and trace the expression of it backward to its earliest physical cause, we shall perceive, that the efforts of man in the domain of action may be assigned to a single source. The simplest of all bodily acts—the raising of one's arm and letting it fall—is productive only of motion. The most complicated of all mechanical inventions is the consequence only of the one result which man can accomplish, the production of force. Of course, the mental faculty which enables a human being, for any given purpose, to will the lifting of his hand, or to invent and use the microscope, is the same in kind, though different in degree, in both cases. We are equally near to and equally far from the discovery in either case, of the connection between mind and matter, and the point of contact between both. But this, at least, is certain, that motion or force is the one and only act approaching that of creation, and affecting the material world, of which man is capable. And the same law is observable in every department of human action, even to the subtle results of chemical analysis, or combination, or experiment. Man's power is confined to the union or separation of matter with mutual affinity or repulsion, to its extension or change of form, and

to its division and multiplication of parts—in other words, to the creation of force or motion.

For instance : The steam-engine which carries us over the land, and across the sea, or which obeys the will of man above the ground or under our feet, is only the result, though doubtless a complicated result, of a single cause, motion or force, created and applied by human agency. Examine its construction. Look at its framework, its boiler, its shafts and cylinders, its cranks and pipes and pistons. Examine the details. Look at a wheel, at the nave, the spokes, the tire; or at the screw, the cap, the axle. Take each part separately. Call to mind its history, if it be wood, from seed to saw mill, and thence to the carpenter's bench ; if it be metal, from mine to furnace, and thence to the anvil of the smith. Consider the endless pairs of hands which the various parts passed through, the almost endless trades by which they were manipulated, each one of which supplied fresh force or motion to that which already had been influenced by given force or motion. Suppose the various parts to be placed in combination, and one of the huge locomotive, or stationary engines with which we are familiar to be the result. Even then, motion and force are still needed to carry the coal and pump the water ; and a handle must be turned hither and thither to produce further force and further motion. In every

part, then, of the engine and in all the parts combined, from the raw material to the polished object, one only cause in almost countless combinations has been at work upon man's side—the creation of force or motion.

Now, nature and grace, in the wide use of both terms, being only two sides of the result of GOD'S will, in two spheres of Divine action, are marked by common peculiarities and features, the issue of a common parentage. Though cognisable by different faculties, governed by different laws, and appealing to different sanctions of authority, they are so far in harmony, that the common or the anomalous in the one may generally be paralleled by uniformity or disorder in the other. The present seems a fair example of the similitude between the natural and supernatural. The single material cause of action on one side may be compared to the single motive principle of action on the other. Motion or force in the order of nature is comparable in the domain of grace to love. As man can produce force or motion only, though under countless combinations, in the physical world; so in the world of morals, and with endless variety of circumstance, man is moved and human force is generated, either naturally or supernaturally, only by the principle of love. This fact is evident by an appeal to everyday life. We will begin with the lowest stratum of human action, and ascend to the highest;

and the same law of motive principle will meet with us in each succeeding case.

For instance: Take the commonest and strongest at once of all natural human sentiments, and determine in what consists its power. Why do we seek for bread to eat, or water to drink, or covering to shelter us? Why do we collect into villages, cities, and states? Why do we consult our doctor, our lawyer, our priest? Why do we organise government, enact laws, pay the police, keep up an army and navy? Why do we cultivate civilization and apply science to common things? Why do we hold preservation to be the first law of the natural man? It is love—a purely natural instinct doubtless in this case, but still love—the love of self.

Again: Take created things apart so immediately from self on the one hand, and from human beings on the other. Why does a man rise early, and late take rest, and eat the bread of carefulness, in the work-room, or the shop, or the counting-house, or the office, or the exchange, in his search after a livelihood? It is love—no doubt under a form of the capital sin of covetousness, but still love—the love of money and of money's worth. Why does a man buy books he never reads, or pictures he seldom looks at? why does he collect curiosities which he puts into a cabinet, or valuables which he locks away in a place of safety?

It is the love of possession, that excess of love which we know, again, as a form of the capital sin of covetousness. Why does a man sacrifice everything of value in life, and jeopardize his eternal welfare, to the infatuation of revenge, or of intemperance, or of impurity? Why does he shatter his health, endanger his business, disgrace his family, beggar his children, and lose his friends? It is love, again; love indeed, under various forms of imperfection, the love of lawless passion and of uncontrolled excess, but still, love.

Again: Why does a man use every effort to "get on in the world," as it is called, to float upward to the surface of society, to rise to the top of the school, to the head of a firm, to the direction of a parish, to the government of a state? Why does he seek to become agreeable to his fellows, of mark among his seniors, of authority to his juniors, of consequence amongst all? Why does he care to have his opinion quoted, his taste admired, his advice sought, his judgment accepted? It is love—the love of influence, of position, of patronage, or of power, forms of that distortion of love which we call the capital sin of pride. Or, why does a man fail "to get on in life," fail to secure friends, fail to take advantage of opportunities, fail to make his fortune, fail in the end even to obtain that which he lost all in attempting to gain, self-satisfaction? It is the love of

present enjoyment beyond the love of future benefit, that form of deficiency in divine love which we know as the capital sin of sloth—yet still love.

Again : Ascend higher in the scale of creation. Leave the case of the mere natural instinct of self-preservation ; leave the case of love imperfect as it appears under the influence of the capital sins : and take the case of man made in GOD'S image, after His likeness. Why does one human being devote himself to another human being, so that the most difficult problem of life is solved, and two independent, if not antagonistic, wills become one ? Why does he toil, or save, or deny himself for some other ? Why does he bear with some other, watch for some other, pray for some other, defend some other, wait for, or sacrifice nearly everything to, some other? Again, it is love ; love in yet a higher, holier, and purer sphere of existence. It is the love of husband or wife: it is the love of parent or child : it is the love of brother or of friend.

Once more and yet higher : Why does a man exercise the most hateful of all things to human nature, self-restraint, self-contradiction, self-sacrifice ? Why does he become humble in the midst of a proud world, or charitable under temptation to envy, or meek when provoked to anger ? Why does he preserve chastity in contact with impure society, become abstemious under

provocation to intemperance, act generously when tempted to parsimony? Why does he prefer future gain and present loss, future pleasure and present pain, future joy and present sadness, future ease and present labour, in virtue of spiritualised diligence, and in opposition to the sin of sloth? Why does he spend hours in prayer at dawn, before others are awake; at mid-day, when others repose; at night, after others are asleep? Why does he undertake work or labour for GOD which is naturally uncongenial, naturally distasteful, naturally wearisome? Why does he embrace the religious life, at the cost of much that man holds dear; or enter the order of the priesthood, with its ceaseless round of labour for souls; or become a missionary in the certainty of death, by disease or martyrdom; or give up all for the sake of ONE Who gave up all for him? Once more, it is love. It is the highest, the holiest, the loftiest, the deepest, the most complete form of love. It is the chiefest motive principle of all human action. It is the love of GOD.

Thus have we seen, that in every department of man's complicated life, under one development or another, there exists but a single motive principle of all human action. This law holds good from the most selfish expression of man's will to the most self-sacrificing; from the love of self only to the love of GOD

chiefly. It is evident from the cases which we have shortly considered. For though the divisions were not definitely marked, yet the instances above given systematically fall under the fourfold form of the motive principle described at the outset, (1) the love of GOD, (2) the love of man, (3) the love of created things, and (4) the love of self. Hence, it may be assumed, whether it be perfect and divine, or whether it be imperfect and human; whether it be for GOD Himself, or for the sake of GOD'S image, or in regard to created things, or in relation to self—the one motive principle of action in man is love.

III.

Pride, Envy, Anger, Sloth, Covetousness, Gluttony, Lust—such is the ghastly catalogue of sins which we have to consider, and to consider in this order, in the following lectures. These are the sins to which we have to apply the first of the truths already enunciated, that love is the principle of human action. These are the sins which, coming from within, as our Blessed LORD says, out of the heart of man, are suggestive of the second truth, that self lies at the foundation of human sin. These are the sins which afford evidence to the third truth, that the deadly sins are the outcome of love imperfect, and the development of selfishness.

These are the sins by which we have to test our belief in the last of the truths above named, that divine love is the antidote of the poison of man's selfishness. And to the second of these propositions we will now turn.

The second of the four fundamental propositions, in the relation between love and self and sin, is this—Selfishness in man is the source and origin of man's deadly sin.

Human selfishness is the parent of human sin. Consider this position, first of all, in general terms, and it will, I think, commend itself to your judgment. Take, for instance, a single class of sins, sins either of omission or commission towards our neighbour in the simplest form. Suppose we witness or hear of any act of unkindness to another in word or deed; any act which it might be wrong to call positively sinful, but which if indulged would become such. Or suppose, we fail to witness or fail to hear of some act of kindness towards another which might reasonably have been expected, and ought to have been done. What is our mental judgment, if not our spoken verdict, upon the act or word, and the sayer or doer of it, in the one case; or upon the sin of omission and the sinner, in the other? Do we not think, do we not say—What selfishness is displayed! How selfish is the man!

Again: Suppose we become conscious of a false report of some friend, or of one which is not false but only too true; of an ill-natured speech which may be either true or false; or even of an opportunity lost of saying a kind word for a friend, of doing justice to an enemy, of defending an absent person, of suggesting a good motive for a deed of which we cannot approve. Suppose we are told of an unfriendly action; or of an action, not positively unkind; or of an action indeed, done with a charitable intent, yet done in a harsh, unloving, inconsiderate manner, with no thought for the feelings of others: or of an action omitted which clearly ought to have been performed. Suppose, again in both these cases, the statement to be made, and the deed to be done, wantonly or hastily; or the kind word and act to have been heedlessly omitted, with no evil design indeed, but equally without good purpose. And suppose, further, that injury comes to the victim of the speech, or annoyance to the object of the deed, or loss ensues to our neighbour from omission; perhaps at the hands, or by the tongue, or from the negligence of some otherwise religiously minded person, who possesses no control over the unruly member, or has failed to master an undisciplined will. Suppose any of these cases to come before us, my Brethren, as domestic judges of our neighbour's conduct; and what do we say of such a

word, what do we say of such a deed? How do we stigmatise such neglect, but that the deed or its omission is an act of selfishness; that the man who spoke or who failed to speak is a selfish man!

Of course, if the act done, or the word spoken, if the act left undone, or the word left unspoken, be the result of pride wounded, of envy excited, or of anger roused; be the effect of the sin of sloth; be connected with covetousness, gluttony or lust, the offence would be the heavier, and our verdict would be more decided and delivered in more emphatic language—How wickedly selfish is the man who hath done this thing! And we should be justified in such an expression of opinion. The false rumour, or the report that is not false but is harmful; the unkind act, or the act of necessary duty performed in a needlessly unkind way; the deed withheld, or the word unspoken, as an act against charity to our neighbour—any of these forms of omission or commission, which take their source from the capital sins, are not only chargeable with selfishness; they are actually sinful.

Will any person venture to deny, in the presence of the deadly sins, when viewed in general terms only, that human selfishness is the parent of human sin? Show me one whose heart is inflamed with the pride of personal importance; whose nerves contract with the envy

of diminished power; whose pulse quickens with the anger of accepted insult—and I will show you a selfish man. I will show you one who loves evil to, or fails to love, those whom he should love as himself, that is his neighbour. Show me one who is all too slack in doing everything to which he sets his hand or turns his mind; who in each relation of life, be it temporal or eternal, is careless, dilatory, or unpunctual, who in a word is slothful—and again, I will show you a selfish man. I will show you one who loves less than he might love the Highest Good, that is GOD; who loves more than he ought to love a lower good, that is himself. Show me one who loves more than he ought to love some lower good of GOD'S creation or bestowal, for its own sake and so far only as it ministers to his own personal gratification: show me one who wishes for that which is not his, covetously; who exceeds the bounds of moderation in food or drink, gluttonously; who falls into the debasing slavery of sensuality, lustfully—and once more, I will show you a selfish man. I will show you one who falls into the last three of the seven capital sins respectively. It is true that such characteristics do not amount to positive evidence, that self is the source, that self lies at the foundation of the deadly sins. But they go far to suggest such to be the case: and they prove, at the least, that considered even in general terms, the

character of the man who is guilty of pride, envy or anger, of sloth, or of covetousness, gluttony or lust, is to an extent chargeable with an element of active selfishness, is certainly embued with the abstract love of self.

If we pass from a general view of the mortal sins, and take a more definite estimate of some of them, we shall find evidence to confirm our earlier suggestion; we shall find evidence which hardly falls short of demonstration as to the origin of human sin, that it is the product of man's selfishness. Indeed, it is no hard task to trace the parentage of selfishness through the hideous features of each one of the seven capital sins. Consider the first three of the sins in order.

1. Take, for example, the sin of pride, high priest as it is in the hierarchy of evil. The proud man, as we shall see when we consider the first of the capital sins, ventures upon the deification of self. He places self above all other. He, the creature of GOD'S hand, denies to GOD the gifts of which he is proud, and claims their merit for himself. He, the steward at most of GOD'S bounty, thinks himself the owner of what he does not even possess; and over-measures the value of what he really enjoys. His selfishness makes him desire the depression of all others below his own level, in order to secure the supremacy which he has conceived of self and to impose upon all others the idolatry of self, of

whom he is at once the chief, if not the only worshipper, of whom he is the one and only prophet. My Brethren, can a more complete picture be drawn, in a few words, of one whose sin owes its origin to self? It is a picture of the selfish man who is a victim of the deadly sin of pride. Can a more convincing proof be afforded, in the case at least of a proud man, that human selfishness is the parent of human sin?

2. One of the daughters of pride is envy. The envious man is the self-acknowledged foe of all others. For every person excels his neighbour in some one particular, if not in more. None, in everything is last, and least, and lowest of all. But another's superiority is the nourishment on which the selfishness of the envious man feeds. He holds it to be an evil to himself, and fears that his own importance may be impaired by competition with another. The envious man, as we shall see when discussing the second of the capital sins, entertains a feeling against three classes of persons, on behalf of self. He encourages a selfish feeling against his inferiors, lest they should become equal with himself: against his equals, because they may become superior to himself: against his superiors, since they cannot be placed in subordination to himself. His selfishness causes him to desire, in theological language, the destitution of all others, in order to anticipate his selfish

fears for the future, in order to calm his selfish passions in the past, in order to indulge his selfish equanimity, if it can be enjoyed, at the present. Here, again, is a portrait, sufficiently near to nature to be recognised, of one whose sin owes its origin to self. It is almost a photograph of the selfish man who has abandoned himself to the deadly sin of envy. And this example tends also to prove, in the case of the second mortal sin, that human selfishness is the parent of human sin.

3. The sin of anger naturally and almost inevitably flows from pride disappointed and from envy unsatisfied. Pride and envy then, from one point of view, are the joint ancestors of the sin of anger; and what is true of that which begot is true also of that which is begotten. The angry man, as we shall call to mind when we estimate the third capital sin, places himself in antagonism with all other, and places all other in opposition to himself. He is possessed by a tendency to think, and at last he acts upon the mental conviction, that all the world is in league against him, and that his vocation is to withstand all the world. In thought, in word, in deed, he takes his own judgment as the standard, his own feeling as the measure, his own experience as the expression of right and wrong; and he moulds his conduct, or lets his conduct mould him, in accordance with such selfish guidance. His be-

setting sin influences him to desire ill or evil to his neighbour for some supposed or actual affront or injury done to himself. And the motive of such desire is selfish, the manner of such desire is selfish, the matter of such desire is selfish, when desire develops into action. This only amounts to the assertion, that human selfishness lies at the foundation, that selfishness is the parent of sin, in the man whom we have attempted to describe. And the man, my Brethren, whom we have shortly sketched is guilty of the third of the capital sins, the sin of anger.

So might we pass in review, and in relation to selfishness the remainder of the deadly sins. It would not be difficult to trace how the love of self is the source and origin, as well as the motive principle and energising force, of the sin of sloth, of covetousness, of gluttony, and of lust. Indeed, the hateful parentage of self, the aggravating influence of selfishness, is more apparent in the case of some of the later sins, than in certain aspects of the former. The slothful, the glutton and the impure can claim more immediate selfish descent, can obtain more actual selfish gratification, respectively, from consent to their deadly sin, than the proud, the envious, or the angry man. Anger and envy almost always bring with them, at the moment of self-indulgence, their own punishment as the result of selfishness—and a

chronic state of either of these two sins can hardly be considered a state of enjoyment. And the atmosphere of pride or envy, with self as an originating cause, is not an atmosphere which even the sinner inhales with perfect satisfaction or content. But it is otherwise with the sensualist, in whatever form deadly sin may be indulged. The act of sinful commission, and the result of sinful delectation, are contemporaneous—whether it be impurity, or excess, or sloth. And in sins of these three classes, it is not so true to say that selfishness is the origin of the sin, or that the sin is the offspring of selfishness, as to affirm that the wickedness and the self-pleasing are identical, and that their names are convertible terms.

Time prevents our following the course of the stream of selfishness under whatever conditions of parentage and development, from fount to mouth, in the case of the last four of the mortal sins. Yet such course may be shortly indicated. Some present, some certain, some direct good, though even to the sluggard a lower personal good, is preferred to some future, possible, indirect, yet higher personal good—and a capital sin ensues. Loving less than he might love the Highest Good, and striving after it all too slackly, the selfish origin brings forth the selfish offspring of sloth. From the nature of the case, and from loving more than they ought to love, for its own sake, some lower good of created things, the covet-

ous, the gluttonous, and the impure, are all and each actuated by the instinct of selfishness. The covetous man indiscriminately desires things bestowed upon others, for himself alone. The glutton desires things common to all, for his personal and selfish gratification. The lustful man desires things confined to some, or allowed only to others, for his individual enjoyment. In all these cases, self lies at the foundation of the sinful desire, self forms the energising principle of the sinful act. In common, therefore, with the deadly sins of pride, envy and anger, it may also be affirmed of the sins of sloth, of covetousness, of gluttony and of lust, that human selfishness is the source and origin of human sin.

IV.

Here we will pause. In our theory of the deadly sins we have advanced by two stages. We have seen to-day

I. That love is the principle of human action : and

II. That self is the parent of human sin.

We will endeavour on another occasion to realise

III. That the deadly sins are the development of selfishness : and lastly

IV. That perfect love is the antidote to self-love.

This will complete the statement of our theory about

sin, and will enable us both to consider systematically one by one, and also to grasp as a whole, the seven mortal or root sins. Our theory about sin, however, though theologically complete, will not be logical in form apart from adhesion to the order of treatment above indicated. The order in which the capital sins are to be discussed will bear repetition. It is this: first, pride; then, envy; next, anger: these are the first three of the sins. Then we shall consider, in the fourth place, the sin of sloth. Lastly, as the fifth of the deadly sins, avarice or covetousness; then, gluttony; and last of all, the sin of impurity, luxury, or lust.

On the present occasion, I shall not speak definitely of the three divisions into which the seven sins thus symmetrically arrange themselves, suggested by the terms above used, love distorted, love defective, love excessive. I will only point out that the ancient Catholic arrangement is symmetrical; and possesses the advantage of being as true to the law of nature, as it is exact in the science of theology. It is an arrangement, also, which it would be well if modern books of devotion more closely followed than they are wont to do. The mortal sins, in the Roman or Anglican manuals, with which I happen to be acquainted, are catalogued in an order which simply defies analysis. Sins of a spiritual character are placed side by side with sins

of a sensual kind ; and the sin of sloth which occupies logically a middle position between the two different sorts of sin, as distinct from and yet involved with both, is placed in any but the central position. The order that we shall follow represents, through the poet, divine and philosopher, Dante, the teaching of the Church in the thirteenth century. And such teaching in brief amounts to this, that, so far as man is concerned, all sin issues from, or may be led back to, seven capital or root sins, sins which, under certain conditions being incompatible with Divine Grace, are called deadly or mortal sins. These seven sins are in part spiritual, in part sensual, in part a combination of both. The first three, pride, envy and anger, are more spiritual in character and less sensual. The last three, covetousness, gluttony and lust, are more sensual in their results, and less spiritual. And the middle sin, the sin of sloth, combines elements from both divisions. Of course, this arrangement of the seven deadly sins is open to criticism. But to say this, is to affirm only what is true of every plan for their orderly division. It were needless to indicate the confusion which exists in other systems. I content myself with claiming fewer inconsistencies in Dante's scheme than in that of any other: and I thankfully shelter myself under the authority of his great name, if such be required, when

I decide upon treating the seven enemies of our soul in the following logical sequence—pride, envy and anger; sloth; avarice or covetousness, gluttony and impurity or lust.

V.

Before concluding I ask leave to draw attention to one further subject which I beg you to bear in mind. I desire that these conferences on the deadly sins may be considered in the light of lectures, and not in the light of sermons. Whatever may be the real distinction between various sorts of addresses delivered from this place in GOD'S holy Name, the differentia in the present case is this: I would wish to appeal more to your understanding than to your affections, to speak more to the head than the heart. I would attempt, GOD helping me, to teach you something—not many but a few things—about the capital or mortal sins, rather than urge you to avoid them, or to cultivate their opposites. It is true, that to depict sin in its real colours, to describe wickedness in its true proportions, even if an indirect, is a powerful argument for its avoidance. But, however essential may be the avoidance of sin, the knowledge of what to avoid is also essential: and my present purpose is to impart such knowledge, not to persuade to such avoidance; is to teach, not to exhort. Hence

the plan which I shall adopt on two points will be as follows:

1. The sins, as I shall hereafter explain, naturally and theologically divide themselves into three clearly marked divisions, according to the cause which respectively produces them, 1. love distorted, 2. love deficient, 3. love excessive. Each of these three divisions will be considered separately, each member of it sin by sin. And each division will be introduced by a lecture which will discuss, more or less fully either certain general principles connected with the deadly sins, or certain other independent questions, which are conveniently considered by themselves. The present lecture will thus be introductory to the first division of the deadly sins, caused by distorted love, a division which includes the sins of pride, of envy and of anger. And the sin of pride will form the subject of our thoughts in the following lecture.

2. As the sins severally are too vast for discussion as a whole within the limits of a single lecture however long, after taking a general survey of the enemy of our soul under examination, I purpose to select a few features in each case for more particular and minute treatment; to analyse them as fully as my power and your patience permit; to view them in the light of the four elementary truths above named; and having, so to say, individualised each of the seven sins, and presented them

to you in their own proper persons, to leave them in your hands for further mental examination and inquiry. In order that we may devote as much time as possible to the analyses, I shall begin without formal preface, I shall end without formal conclusion. And I will only add, that I earnestly beg your prayers for my guidance, that what I shall be allowed to say may tend to the good of souls, and to the greater glory of GOD the FATHER.

A. M. D. G.

LECTURE TWO.

OF THE DEADLY SIN OF PRIDE:

THE FIRST SIN OF LOVE DISTORTED.

"*The ungodly is so proud, that he careth not for* GOD*: neither is* GOD *in all his thoughts.*" PSALM X. 4.

I.

PRIDE, the chief of the deadly sins, and the first of the sins caused by distorted love, pride is divided by spiritual writers into four distinct heads. In each of these four divisions of the sin we may trace, with more or less clearness, the influence of the theory which we endeavour to work out. In each we may discover the respective relation of, and inter-dependence between, love and self and sin which has been already stated. In each we may see that self is the origin of sin, that love is the antidote to the poison of self. We will consider these four divisions in order, marking their characteristic features, and noting their characteristic failings.

II.

I. We may be guilty of pride, in the first place, by imputing to ourselves and not to GOD, the gifts which we have received of Him, whether of nature or of grace. This is the highest type, the completest form of pride. It is the pride of the creature against the Creator, rebellious and idolatrous. It is emphatically pride, pride absolute and of itself, pride pure and simple, as distinguished from all other sorts of pride, notably from three: 1. ambitious pride; 2. presumptuous pride; and 3. conceited pride, which is mere vanity. It is the chiefest factor in the proud man's composition, and engulphs all other and less sinful characteristics again, specially three: 1. self-esteem; 2. self-deceit; 3. self-consciousness. It may be termed that form of idolatry which is world-wide in extent, and which is limited only in time by man's creation, human worship, the worship of self. Self with the proud man is the final cause of all that he is, of all that he believes himself to be. And the form which imperfect love takes with the proud self-worshipper is that of love distorted. It is, however, love distorted from the Creator, not towards the creature. Hence, this form of imperfect love occupies a position of its own, of which it may be said, that in

proportion as the Creator excels the creature in the infinity of His perfections, so does the faintest sin of love distorted from GOD exceed in intensity the most decided act of distorted love towards man, infinitely. And one main failing which characterises this kind of pride is ingratitude. For S. Paul charges the selfish proud man with a want of thankfulness.

II. We may fall into the sin of pride, secondly, by ascribing to our own merit the gifts and graces which are ours only by the uncovenanted mercy and free bounty of GOD. This form of pride occupies a lower platform than the idolater of self stands upon; yet, a platform almost insensibly lower. For, although the proud man, in this case, admits that the gifts which he enjoys are not of himself, he holds to the plea, that such graces are his by reason of his own intrinsic merit. He looks upon himself as the meritorious cause of his natural or supernatural possessions: if inherited, by anticipation; if acquired, as a reward. The vice which chiefly marks this form of pride, is ambition; a vice which sometimes its cause, and sometimes its consequence, always is connected with self-esteem. And here, in the development of ambitious pride, we pass from the pride of man against GOD, to the pride of one creature against another. Ambition, from our standpoint, requires an object for its exercise: and

in a strife for the mastery, the interests of our fellow-creatures are and must be sacrificed to those of self, by one guilty of this form of pride. The ambitious man, therefore, as well as the idolater of self, is essentially a selfish man; a believer in self, as the cause of his ambition; an agent in behalf of self, when ambition is at work; a well satisfied recipient of self-esteem, when ambition finds its reward. And the love he bears in his heart is the love of self, not the love of GOD. It is imperfect love, or love distorted. It is a love which loves ill, a love which loves evil to those whom he should love as himself, namely, his neighbour.

III. By believing ourselves to have talents and perfections which we have not, we sin by pride in a third fashion. This is, again, another instance of pride which sins, not so much against GOD as against our fellow-man. For the result of our mistaken belief in our own powers leads to presumption; and presumption in act, from our point of view, necessitates a person against whom the sin may be committed. This kind of pride is altogether of a lower and more debased character, both intellectually and morally, than pride caused by ambition, or than pride of which ingratitude is a feature. Ingratitude, indeed, is of a black, immoral hue. But a sinner who is thankless to GOD, may yet

in his conduct towards man be upright, and may also be honest in his convictions. Ambition, too, may lead both to dishonesty of intention, and to conduct the opposite of upright : yet not of necessity does it lead thither. But the man who is the victim of self-deceit is below the level of both : and self-deceit is the parent of that form of pride which we call presumption. The man who believes in himself and acts up to his belief, and the man who fulfils his ambitious plans by means which he knows to be at his disposal, moves in a different plane to one who aims at that which he is incapable to accomplish, who fancies himself possessor of that of which he is deficient. Such intellectual obtuseness, such moral blindness, is self-deception. Action founded upon self-deception becomes presumption. And in acts of presumption, self is considered the efficient cause by the proud man. Whilst the love which fills the heart of the presumptuous-proud is imperfect love. A false estimate of his own powers, involves a false estimate of the powers of others. And distorted love causes him to love evil to his neighbour, when presumption makes him desire their depression, in order to secure his own exaltation.

IV. Lastly, by valuing ourselves for qualities which we may fairly lay claim to, or actually possess, we sin, in the matter of pride, through the fault of self-

consciousness, vanity, vain-glory, or conceit. This is, perhaps, the lowest depth to which pride can fall. It combines features of the first two forms of pride, caused by self-worship and self-esteem; and only escapes comparison with the third, caused by self-deceit, by reason of GOD'S gift of certain qualities. Vanity, however, exaggerates the other three forms of pride. It increases presumption; it stimulates ambition; it makes self-worship almost a reality. Indeed, the earlier developments of pride are rarely unaffected by the later. For the tendency of all sin is to degenerate with intensity; and pride absolute, pride presumptuous, and pride deceptive, naturally descend in the scale of sin to pride that, by reason of self-conceit, becomes contemptuous. This feature in self-consciousness places the last development of pride in a class by itself. We have discussed the pride of man against GOD, under the aspect of self-idolatry. We have also considered, under features of ambitious and presumptuous pride, the pride of the creature against his fellow. But, in the present form of pride, we discover the pride of man against himself, consequent upon self-valuation: for self, to the vain man, is the justifying cause of self-estimation. And though the self-conscious man, equally with the self-worshipper, does not necessarily take action, in regard to his neighbour, upon the strength

of self-valuation ; yet, undoubtedly, his temptation lies in that direction, and the love by which he is instigated is a form of imperfect love, or love distorted.

Thus have we seen that there are at least four different kinds of pride, all of which possess their several characteristic features and feelings :

There is 1. pride absolute, a form of boundless ingratitude towards GOD, of which self-worship is the exponent, and in which self is believed to be of existence the final cause. This kind of pride sins by ascribing to self and not to GOD, the gifts we have received from His almighty hand.

There is 2. ambitious pride, at once both issue and origin, under various contingences, of self-esteem, in which self is considered by the proud man to be the meritorious cause of his perfection. Sin is here produced by attributing to our own merit the gifts which are due to GOD'S free mercy.

There is 3. presumptuous pride, the result of self-deceit, the victim of which acts upon the principle that self is the efficient cause of all he presumes to effect. Here the proud man sins by believing himself to be endued with powers which he possesses not, and by acting on such false belief through self-deceit.

There is 4. pride contemptuous, vain-glorious pride, pride caused by self-consciousness and self-conceit,

in which self plays the part of justifying cause to the sinner in the deadly sin of pride. And his sin consists in this, that the proud man values himself for qualities which he certainly commands.

Of these four developments of pride, the first has reference to the Creator chiefly; the last, chiefly to the creature. Between these extremes, man's fellow-man is the object of human pride. The second form has regard to action within the power of the agent; the third, to action which the agent is powerless to perform. From the terms of their description, self evidently lies at the foundation of this fourfold development. From the effects of their agency, love, imperfect love, or love distorted is clearly the motive principle of its action. It may be, therefore, easily allowed, that each division of the sin of pride in turn is only a form of developed selfishness. It will not be contested that the cure for loving ill or evil to the Creator or the creature, can only be found in the perfection of love, the love of GOD as GOD, and the love of man for GOD'S sake.

Having thus considered some of the fourfold characteristics of this deadly sin, we are now in a position to attempt a more formal definition of pride. Pride, then, may be said to be an inordinate belief in, desire of, or love for self-excellence, not for the greater glory of GOD,

not for the good of souls, not for the benefit of created things, but for the love of self. Pride creates self-satisfaction and feels self-complacency by reason of actual or imagined excellence, which we either have or pretend to have, in gifts and qualities, whether of grace or nature, whether external or internal, whether inherited or acquired. Pride justifies self-worship, flatters self-esteem, encourages self-deceit, magnifies self-consciousness, as a means to an end—self-exaltation, and by consequence depreciation of others. Self-excellence, in relation to pride, is subject to no limits, human or divine. In whatever manner one of GOD'S creatures can excel, or can try to excel, another, there is an opening for pride. In whatever way man may worship self, or value self, there pride can find admittance. No prize is too high for pride to aim at—even equality with the Almighty. No advantage is too small to be secured—even the worthless praise of men. Pride influences our relations with GOD, with our soul, with man, at least in three ways: in thought and word and deed. 1. In thought—if we may personate the sin—it ventures on comparison with the All-perfect; it magnifies self-importance; it despises our neighbour. 2. In word, it excuses or defends itself against GOD; justifies self-estimation; boasts of success over others. 3. In deed, it denies homage to the Creator; compasses its own

advantage; plots against the efforts of its neighbour. It revolves in an endless chain of cause and effect. For, pride is powerless to believe in self and not to wish for self-exaltation. It is unable to wish for self-advancement, and not to take steps to fulfil its heart's desire. And it is the result of obtaining its heart's desire, that pride is confirmed in the belief of self.

Pride, as has been well said, is the mother of all vices, especially of the four already mentioned, 1. self-worship, 2. ambition, 3. presumption, 4. vain-glory. Let us endeavour yet more clearly to distinguish between these four forms of pride.

First of all: Self-worship, or pride considered in the abstract, in undeveloped simplicity, contemplates self alone. It sets up self as the object of its own and the world's idolatry; self, as the one object of belief, desire, and love; self, as the one object above all other of thought and care, to whose gratification all else must be sacrificed; self, as the beginning, middle, end of everything. This form of pride contains in solution all other forms, because it attributes to self and not to GOD all that it has received at His beneficent hands.

Secondly: Ambition aims at self-excellence in the way of honour, dignity, power, and position; in the way of genius, talent, and knowledge; in the way of wealth,

of personal influence, personal affection, and even of virtue and holiness of life. It aims at self-exaltation, in being set above all other as the due reward of self-desert.

Thirdly: Presumption seeks to excel in the way of great achievements, undertaken at the instance of self-deceit; or of small achievements attempted under the influence of self-delusion. The motive being unworthy, the work is marred in principle. The estimate of self being false, the effort fails, deservedly, ignominiously fails, from its own want of capacity, or intelligence, or energy, or perseverance.

Lastly: Vain-glory pretends to excellence in the way of glory; in the way, that is, of desire of and satisfaction in being known, or noticed, or talked about; in being praised, or esteemed, or valued by others. It matters not whether such esteem or publicity be, or be not, deserved. The sin lies not in the fact, but in the sentiment: not in the action or thought of others, but in the delectation which ensues from overvaluing ourselves.

Time, my Brethren, would fail us to consider the influence upon our daily life of each of the four sorts of pride which have been above named; or to discuss in detail their developments, which have been sketched in outline. I purpose, therefore, to disregard entirely

two of the forms—the two middle forms; and to confine our attention to the other two—the first and the last. Ambitious pride and pride presumptuous are so obviously the outcome of selfishness, are so clearly counteracted by the principle of love, that they need not be further analysed. It is different with the two remaining forms of pride. Pride absolute, pride which credits self and not GOD with the gifts of His hands; and vain-glorious pride, which overvalues self for gifts which it admits come from GOD—these two developments of pride are not so generally allowed to be affected by our theory of the capital sins. We will therefore consider firstly, self-worship, and secondly, self-conceit, in a few practical examples taken from every-day life. We will consider them with a view to ascertain whether or not they are caused by human selfishness, whether or not they may be cured by divine love.

III.

Before we proceed to consider pride under the aspect of self-worship and self-conceit, it may be well, by way of contrast, to set before you, my Brethren, two or three instances of the effect of the opposite of the sin, namely the virtue of humility. But it is difficult at once to make a selection from the many cases on record in the lives of the saints, and to escape the repetition of those

which must be familiar to you. Take, however, a few commonplace examples of virtue which is not at all commonplace.

It is related in the life of S. Pachomius, that on paying a visit to a certain monastery, he set himself, after prayer in common, to work with the community in making baskets. As he was engaged in this manual toil, a young lad chanced to pass by who, stopping curiously to observe the saint, boldly said to him, "Father Abbot, that is not the way to make baskets." At these words the man of GOD arose, as if a rebuke had come from the superior of his order, and humbly replied: "Pray, my child, be so good as to show me how they are to be made." The lad, unabashed, showed the aged man "how Abbot Theodore was wont to make them;" and S. Pachomius resuming his task without change of expression, or even without being mentally annoyed, complied with the directions of his youthful instructor. My Brethren, do we receive with equal humility the correction even of our superiors?

One day as S. Anthony was praying, he heard an inward voice saying to him: "Anthony, thou hast not gained that point of perfection to which a certain leather-dresser of Alexandria has attained." The saint immediately set out in search of the leather-dresser, and having found him, demanded of him in

the name of our LORD, his manner of life. "Sir," said the devout man, "I do not know that I have ever performed a good action in my life. So that the moment I awake in the morning, I say to myself, 'Every one else in this city will save his soul, and I alone, on account of sins, seem destined to lose mine.' The same I say when I go to bed: and such I really feel to be my state." "No, no," answered the saint, "by your pious device you have gained heaven, whilst I, by a want of such humility, have not attained to your measure of perfection."

Take another story as a parable. It was once permitted to S. Macarius to behold Satan in a visible form endeavouring to injure him. But the great enemy of souls was unable to do so; for as soon as he approached the saint the devil's power forsook him. At this he became enraged; and power was given to the holy man to hear his complaint. "I suffer much from thee, Macarius," said Satan, "because though I greatly desire to hurt thee, I am not able." "How may that be?" returned Macarius. "I do all that thou doest," said the enemy, "and even more. You fast often; but I never eat. You sleep, but little indeed; yet I never close my eyes. You observe your vow of chastity; but I am not a victim of impurity. You are almost always about your Father's business; but I am never absent from

mine. In one respect only you surpass me." "And what is that?" asked the man of GOD. The devil answered, as he disappeared from sight: "It is your great humility."

S. François de Sales was so fulfilled with the spirit of humility, that on one occasion he is reported to have used these remarkable words: "I wish it were the will of GOD that my innocence should never be known, not even in the awful day of judgment; but that it might be always hidden and concealed for all eternity in the abyss of the divine wisdom." At another time he said: "If GOD has ever allowed me to do a good work, my chief joy and contentment would be that at the day of judgment, when the secrets of all hearts shall be made manifest, GOD alone should know my good works; but that my evil deeds, on the contrary, should be displayed to all created beings." And the same spirit animated S. Vincent de Paul, who would never justify himself to man against false accusations, but was wont to say: "How many calumnies were uttered against the LORD JESUS; and yet He never justified Himself against them:" or "Let such an one say what he pleases; I will never justify myself except by my works." My Brethren, do we sympathise with the feelings of these great saints of GOD? Can we honestly make their words our own?

We will now turn to the consideration of the two forms of pride which await examination.

IV.

I. In the first place, pride attributes to self and not to GOD the natural or supernatural gifts which we have received from Him. This kind of pride has been termed, idolatry of self. One would suppose, indeed, that this was almost the last form which pride would take in the heart of a reasonable being, not to say of a religiously-minded man. Experience shows that it is amongst one of the first. Yet, our absolute nothingness in the sight of GOD; the fact, that we came from nothing at His word, and are kept from a return to nothing by His will; the truth, that we have nothing but from Him, that we know nothing but of Him, that we can do nothing but with Him, should make us grateful for what we have received, should prevent us from denying that we have received it. Neither is the testimony of mankind without weight. For, the universal belief of every human being, that every other human being has nothing of which to boast before GOD, should not be ignored. Consider for a moment a few items in our debtor's account with the Giver of All. Creation and the hope of heaven; a measure of prosperity and worldly success; the gift of reason and intellect; the

blessings of civilisation and peaceful times; more or less preservation from accident, grief, failure, or care; a body capable of enjoyment through the senses, and a soul enriched by the sacraments—these are but some of the manifold bounties which we owe to GOD'S free mercy alone. To lay claim, then, to self-excellence on behalf of these gifts, to invest ourselves with importance for their possession, to assert our origination of them, and to boast ourselves because of them, is to attack the attributes of GOD Himself in His works. It is to diminish His glory, which He will not share with another. It is to place man on GOD'S throne, and to limit the GODHEAD to the proportions of humanity.

Now, how does this kind of pride bear outward evidence of its existence in the heart? In answering this question, a remarkable inconsistency appears. It will be found, as a rule which almost amounts to a law, that persons pride themselves more on what is independent of them, than on what to a certain extent they are the cause of, or are meritorious for. For example: The man who is a worshipper of self is proud, we will suppose, of his birth; of many forms of pride one of the most foolish to be proud of; for of many things which happen to us, one as to which we were least consulted. Gentle blood and long descent, like all of GOD'S gifts, possess their own value, which it is unwise in those who

have them not, and ungrateful in those that have them, to deny. But, it not infrequently happens, that pride of birth to an idolater of self, if his feelings be carefully analysed and plainly expressed, means this—that his ancestors have cause to be proud of the man, rather than that the man has cause to be proud of his ancestors. This is one form of pride in the worshipper of self, the pride of birth.

Again: Is the self-idolater a man of fortune or property? And, my Brethren, each one of us is wealthy in comparison with those who lack what we possess: each one of us is wealthy absolutely, in regard to GOD'S common gifts to a common humanity. But take the case only of worldly goods. We all enjoy a certain amount of property. There was a time when we were possessed of none. Whence did riches come? Did we inherit them? Of whose will, think you, came it to pass, that we were born of well-to-do parentage, that we were, as a fact, our own father's child? Was it of our own will; or was it of GOD'S will? Did we create our wealth, as we say, by capital or labour, by industry or speculation? But, of what sort, I ask, is that effort of creation, which one step removed from self ceases in any sense to be creation? If any one will assure me that his possessions were self-created without the aid even of secondary agents, I shall be content to admit that he

owes no debt of gratitude to the First Great Cause of all wealth. The pride of wealth, then, specially in cases where we have benefited by the labour or success of others; not less than the pride of birth, where no choice was offered us of parentage—both chargeable with ingratitude towards GOD—is another evidence of that sort of pride which exults in the worship of self.

Again: Take the case of any moral or religious quality. Take the case of patience. Suppose we have a character for patience, more or less deserved, at the present moment. We know, as a fact, that the last time we felt provoked we exercised the virtue of patience. But how was it with us the time before, or the time before that? How was it on the first occasion on which our patience was tested? Of course, memory fails us. But the intellect may make answer. How, then, did we act? There are two contingences. If our patience failed us, nothing further can be said. If our patience failed us not, we exercised the virtue in question. It is clear that we could not have formed the habit of patience; for it was the first time that the grace had been exerted: and a habit is formed only by repetition. If, then, we remained patient under the trial, our virtue on that occasion could owe its origin alone to one of two causes. It was either self-created; or it was given us by another. It matters not at all whether we

inherited a sweet disposition; whether the grace had been bestowed in Baptism; whether it was one of the sevenfold gifts of Confirmation; whether it was a reward of Confession; whether it was given us at the Altar; whether it was imparted at the moment of temptation, immediately inspired by GOD'S HOLY SPIRIT. The act of patience was not self-created. That is the point to be observed. For its bestowal, therefore, gratitude is due to GOD from man. For its possession, we have no claim upon the worship of self.

Once more: Consider the gift of knowledge. Does knowledge arise from intuition or experience, from instinct or intellect, from talent or genius, from exertion or study? It matters little for our argument. The important question is this—Whence comes the capacity for knowledge? Is the capacity self-originated, or was it bestowed of GOD? Men may say: Knowledge has become mine at a large expense in time, money, labour, thought. Knowledge with me is a composition of many integral parts, of many variable proportions. Application in childhood, perseverance in youth, contemplation in adult age—these are elements in my hold upon knowledge. I have been taught by clever persons, have talked with able men, have read learned books, and have made my

own, by mental digestion, all the knowledge I have acquired. All this, and more than all this, may be allowed, my Brethren. But we can only return to the simple question—Who gave us the capacity for gaining knowledge?—in order to see that the means of acquiring knowledge, in common with the virtue of patience, in common with the gift of wealth, and in common with the accident of birth, comes to us from the hand of GOD. It was not self-created. Whilst, then, GOD has many claims upon the gratitude of His creature for the faculty of obtaining knowledge, man has no just cause for self-worship in the possession of the gift.

These four cases of birth, of wealth, of patience, of knowledge, are but typical cases. They are typical of the many forms which the first and deadliest development of pride may assume in the ordinary details of daily life. They are typical, also, of the divisions of man's complicated organization which self-worship may influence. They represent the bounty of GOD to man, in relation both to the world without and to himself within. They are connected with gifts of nature and gifts of grace, with intellectual and moral qualities. They are commonplace enough; but they are sufficiently wide to support a theory. Three of the cases, indeed, admit of a retort, that the bene-

factions of GOD are partially dependent upon man's free-will for their use, upon man's co-operation for their perfection. But half-truths may well be disregarded in the presence of complete statements of truth. And the complete statement is the theory of which the above cases are examples; is the truth, that everything we have and everything we are, that both germ and seed of all we enjoy outwardly and of all we cultivate within, is due, not to ourselves, but to Another. It is simply pride which makes us attribute to ourselves and not to GOD, the gifts and qualities we have received from Him, whether natural or superhuman. It is pride absolute; pride of the creature against the Creator; pride caused by ingratitude; the pride of idolatry of self.

Need anything be added, in order to show that the worshipper of self, who is proud towards GOD, lives under the influence of human selfishness? Need anything be said to prove, that such evidence of ingratitude for GOD'S bounties is to be counteracted only by love which is perfect and divine? My Brethren, I think that in either case there is no need.

V.

II. Secondly: Pride causes us to overvalue ourselves for qualities which we actually possess: and this is the

other form of the deadly sin of which we have to seek for a practical example. The mere conceited man furnishes an instance. And the conceited man, as we shall consider him, occupies a different position in the development of pride to either the ambitious or the presumptuous, whose cases, you remember, we shall not discuss. He is less a man of action, than a man of purpose; less a man of effort, than one of intention. He suggests more than he does; he plans even more than he begins. Vanity, perhaps, is the most harmless form of pride in regard to others: it is one of the most vexatious in relation to ourselves. The mere conceited man is a lamentable spectacle when his character is analysed and the result is tabulated: and although he is more his own enemy than his neighbour's, conceit is a form of pride which, from its frequency and pointedness, needs a large amount of Christian charity to tolerate in another. He is a proud man, observe, to begin with; otherwise he would not now be under moral vivisection. But he cannot command the sympathy which the ambitious man extorts, by largeness of mind, power over others, and success. He cannot claim the pity which falls to the share of the presumptuous man, from his efforts, his struggles, and his failure. From a worldly point of view, he is simply contemptible, as his form of the sin of pride causes him to be contemptuous.

From a religious aspect, he supplies a warning—lacking talent to attain success, lacking energy to avoid disaster. Yet there is nothing, he flatters himself, that he cannot do, if he wills only to do it; there is nothing he is not equal to secure, if only he puts his mind into the matter. Indeed, on his own valuation, he can do many things better than most persons; and there are few he is unable to surpass, if only he is allowed the opportunity.

Remember, the conceited man possesses the gifts and qualities which the ambitious man employs, and of which the presumptuous man is destitute. But the self-conscious being begins and ends in vanity. He is too much occupied in the alone possession of natural gifts or super-human graces to employ them. He is too well satisfied with the supposed perfection of such qualities to improve them. He is spared failure, certainly, but only because he makes no effort to succeed. But he is equally far from success, because he dares not hazard a failure. He always thinks himself capable of doing what others do, yet he never does; but he is always equal to offer advice, which himself seldom follows. In short, he lives within himself. He is absorbed in self-contemplation. He is enabled to estimate his own excellence, without the danger of practical comparison with others, without the chance of dispelling

the delusion, by acting on the strength of his own self-estimate.

Such, my Brethren, is a sketch of a mere conceited man viewed from within. Of such a one, is it too much to affirm, that his besetting form of pride is the outcome of one side of human selfishness? Let us next inquire how the self-conscious man, outwardly, comes in contact with his neighbour. Perhaps this consideration will suggest that his sin may be counteracted by divine love.

Now, how does the vain man manage to impinge upon others from without? It is hard to say in what matter, or on what occasions the self-sufficient mortal does not force himself on any person who comes within his sphere of influence. No question is too large, no question is too small, for his cognizance. No subject is too vast, no subject is too insignificant, for his mastery. The conceited man is equal to all occasions, is baffled by none. Are you placed in a difficult or dangerous position? He can at once deliver you. Do you suffer from pain, distress, or sorrow? He can relieve you. Does he see you engaged on ordinary work? He knows a method of action more speedy and effective. Are you employed in discovery or invention? He has long thought-out a means to an end which anticipates and eclipses your own. Have you to consult

and act on behalf of a third person? The vain man is certainly better acquainted with the third person's mind than you can be; and probably knows your own mind better than yourself.

Is it, again, an adventure you have met with, a story you have heard, a fact you call to mind? The conceited man can remember a more apposite fact, will repeat a better story, has met with a more startling adventure. Is it a public or political question? He has sources of information more reliable than your own. Is it a matter of private information, or of a confidential character? He possesses knowledge more secret than the most involved. It is the same with business. His mode of meeting demand by supply will bring in a larger per-centage than your method. It is the same with art. His late school of painting is more worthy of admiration or imitation than your early masters. It is the same in science, or in history, or in philosophy. The books he advises, the lectures he attends, the authorities he follows, are incomparably better than those you believe in, listen to, or read. It is the same with every other subject of human interest, upon which a difference of opinion may be held by different persons, or in regard to which the same thing may take various forms, not even excepting religion and the mysteries of the faith. Nothing in heaven or earth comes amiss to a

conceited man on which to exercise his office. And his office, you will not forget, is this—to minister to an inordinate belief in, desire for, or love of, self-excellence, not for the glory of GOD, not for the good of souls, not for the benefit of the Creator, but for the love of self, under the influence of the sin of pride.

To this unlovely picture of a most unlovable and unloving being, I will only add, that it is not all who act thus of whom I speak. It is not all who act as the vain man acts, who are guilty of self-consciousness, but only some. The sympathetic, the charitable, the kind, the humble, may, on occasions, think and say and do, rightfully, things which would be chargeable on the conceited man as sin. Persons, also, may be placed in a position of authority, or of trust, or of responsibility, when duty may demand at their hands action or advice such as the vain, proud man, whom duty calls not, would sinfully offer or sinfully perform. Or one friend, of his own free-will, may submit himself to another friend to an extent that necessitates mediation with a third, which, apart from such subjection, might be called the result of self-sufficiency. But these cases influence our argument not at all. It is not of the kind and sympathetic that I speak, but of the vain; not of those in authority, but of those without authority; not of friendly, brotherly counsel, but of

conceited interference. I speak of those who are influenced by imperfect and human love, not by love which is divine and perfect; of those who are guilty of that form of pride in regard to self which develops self-consciousness, and which may only be counteracted by the love of GOD as GOD, and the love of GOD'S image for GOD'S sake.

VI.

Take one more, and that the last, estimate of the deadly sin of pride. Take a practical estimate of its various forms with a view to its suppression. If we will remember the point of observation from whence we view this sin, and the relation which we find it to bear upon ourselves, we shall obtain so definite an idea of its suppression generally, that it may, with little difficulty, be made particular to our own individual case. We have viewed pride, then, as the first of those influences which prove that self is the origin and source of human sin, and that divine love is the antidote to the poison of selfishness. And as we have seen that there are at least four different forms of the sin so we may also perceive that there are four different ways of counteracting its malign influence.

1. In the first place, pride may succumb to self-

sacrifice and love energised, by diminishing the justifying cause of sin to the proud man, which we have seen to be self-conceit. How is it, Brother or Sister in CHRIST, that you and I, of all persons in the world, possess this over-valuation of ourselves? How is it that you and I, who know ourselves so much better than our neighbours know us, who are known to GOD so much better than we know ourselves, fall into this sin of self-conceit? How is it that we, whom GOD and ourselves, if not our neighbours, know to be guilty of such and such a fault; to be possibly accountable for further imperfection; to be responsible for more grace squandered than we can affirm of any other; to have missed more opportunities for good than have been so much as offered to many—how can we be puffed up with this form of the sin of pride?

Nor are these questions not to the point. For the mental and moral, the intellectual and religious part of our nature are so intimately connected, that they act and react upon one another with strange intercommunion. A conquest over one division in either element of our being, will afford or enable us to secure a more than ordinary insight into any of the others. Hence, if we obtain a true estimate of our own character devotionally, we may form an accurate opinion of ourselves socially, or an opinion sufficiently

accurate to prevent our lapsing into pride. And a man who knows himself by confession, as GOD knows him, or even as his confessor knows him, will hardly fall deeply, will surely not fall past recovery into self-deception and self-conceit. If then we can but realize how little worthy we actually are of our own good opinion, tested by the knowledge gained in the sacrament of penance, we shall have done much towards subduing, in the lower stages of the sin, that form of pride which we call vanity or self-conceit.

2. Secondly: A check given to pride on the lower platform of self-conceit, will afford us considerable advantage in a contest with sin in the next higher stage in which the sin assails us—pride presumptuous.

For, if we are self-assured that we are not of value even in our own sight, it will be long ere we take so false an estimate of our powers as to attempt that for which failure will declare them to have been unequal. A just estimate of our own capacity will inevitably check self-deceit, and will save us from the folly of supposing self to be the efficient cause of human action, under the delusions of pride presumptuous.

3. Having thus been furnished with a just estimate of ourselves as a corrective of self-conceit; and having relieved ourselves from a false estimate of our powers, in spite of the delusions of self-deception, we shall be the

more prepared to conquer self in the domain of self-esteem. We shall never allow self to usurp the position of meritorious cause to our actions. We shall never ascribe to our own merit the ambition which tempts us, the ambition which moves us, the ambition which even causes us to succeed. And the third development of the sin, as ambitious pride, will be dispelled.

4. Lastly: Rising by these three stages from a knowledge of self gained by examination of conscience and confession of sin; treading down contemptuous self-conceit; mounting upon presumptuous self-deception; and soaring above self-esteem in ambition—we may finally hope to conquer pride absolute, self-worship, or idolatry of self; pride, caused by ingratitude towards GOD; pride, which elevates itself into a great final cause. This victory will give us power to conquer self at its source, self in its stronghold. It will enable us to attribute all we are, and all we have, and all we do, not to self, but to GOD.

A. M. D. G.

LECTURE THREE.

OF THE DEADLY SIN OF ENVY:

THE SECOND SIN OF LOVE DISTORTED.

"*Pilate answered them, saying, 'Will ye that I release unto you the King of the Jews?' For he knew that the chief priests had delivered Him for envy.*" S. MARK XV. 9 and 10.

I.

THE second of the capital sins, and the second of the sins which owe their origin to distorted love, is Envy. And Envy has been described as inordinate and selfish uneasiness of mind at another's good.

This, so far as it goes, is a fairly accurate description of envy, because it embraces the principle of both the active and passive side of the mental aspect of this deadly sin. The definition, you will observe, is negative in form. The state of mind, it affirms in other words, the state of mind which is not at peace with itself, which is not at peace with its neighbour, which

is not at peace with its GOD, at the good of another, is the subject of envy. And this is comparable to the parallel and inspired definition of the Christian virtue which is the opposite of the capital sin, namely, brotherly-love. Charity, saith the Apostle, envieth not. In other words, the state of mind which envieth not, which is not unpeaceful with its GOD, which is not unpeaceful with its neighbour, which is not unpeaceful with itself, bears one of the marks of charity. For charity and envy, the temper of mind which loves good to its neighbour, and the temper of mind which feels uneasy at its neighbour's good, are incompatible the one with the other. They are mutually antagonistic.

For instance: Take a case stated in general terms. Charity rejoices at the good of one's neighbour on two grounds: 1, as increasing the total sum of human happiness; and 2, as adding to the greater glory of GOD. But envy feels uneasy at the good of one's neighbour on two grounds: 1, as not necessarily increasing our own happiness; and 2, as indirectly taking away from the glory of ourself. Whilst, then, charity tends to augment the greater glory of GOD by acts of human sympathy, envy tends to lessen GOD'S glory, by withholding human sympathy. Indeed, the envious man would limit GOD'S goodness to himself, or would limit it in regard to his

neighbour. But the charitable man would rather seek to follow in the spirit of the Apostle's unselfish desire, who could wish himself accursed from CHRIST for his brethren's sake. He would rather limit GOD'S goodness from himself, as being less worthy than his neighbour; would rather include his neighbour in all good things, as being at least equally worthy with himself to enjoy them, and perhaps more. In short, the envious man is a distorter of charity—he distorts the divine principle of brotherly-love. He is uneasy in mind at another's good. He does not accept the apostolic precept: If one member of the body corporate rejoice, all the members should rejoice with it. He would introduce schism into the Christian body. He would invert the theory of charity, and distort the law of love, saying: If one member of the body corporate benefit, all the members may be discontented with and be mortified at it.

The definition of envy as uneasiness of mind at another's good, is a fairly sound definition, as has been said, so far as it goes. But it does not go far enough. It is content with stating a negation. The sin of envy, however, has a positive, as well as a negative side. He who suffers from distortion of love, becomes the agent of love distorted. And it is only when bodily action is taken upon a state of mental uneasiness, that envy

obtains its full proportions. Love distorted—as a sentiment—will eventually cause us actively to love evil to those whom we should love as ourselves. The distorter of love, esteeming his own self-importance to be lessened, or his own self-interest to be endangered, by another's advancement, (and thinking nothing of GOD'S glory or man's welfare,) will inevitably develope into desiring that other's destitution and compassing the same. For, envy is not only a state of feeling, but a condition of activity. And a complete definition of the deadly sin can only be composed by combining these two elements, thus: An inordinate and selfish uneasiness of mind at another's good, and action which ensues from such want of peace, constitutes the capital sin of envy.

Here we must distinguish. Envy is usually considered as one of the spiritual sins, in distinction, for example, to gluttony, which is supposed to be wholly, or almost wholly, sensual. But, in common with most, if not with all the deadly sins, envy is in part bodily, in part mental. So far as it answers to the first portion only of the definition, of feeling selfish uneasiness at another's good, it remains spiritual alone. When it has become developed, so as to fall under the heading of the last portion of the definition, namely, of active unpeacefulness, it ceases to be only a spiritual sin.

But envy seldom remains in a single phase. Now, it is the tendency of much, if not of all mental feeling, to find expression in bodily action, either by word or deed. Envy is no exception to this experience. Unless checked by sacramental power, lawless and loveless desire, find speedy consummation in loveless and lawless activity. And envy pays homage to this principle. Hence, envy becomes a corporal sin, when action develops from feeling: envy remains a spiritual sin, so long as it exists mentally, without development into action. It is a spiritual sin so long as it questions only the will of Almighty GOD in bestowing upon others that which He has not showered upon us; which, in our opinion, others do not deserve; or which we deserve equally with, or more than others. It becomes a corporal sin when we take action upon the estimate which we have formed of GOD'S dealings, and seek to alter, to modify, to reverse, or to restrain them. In the mental phase of the sin, to use the language of the Litany, "envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness" of feeling are the results. In the bodily phase, the sin gives birth in word, to unjust judgment, to hasty criticism, to religious gossip, scandal-talking, and detraction; and in act, it produces every wicked deed which may legitimately ensue.

Envy, then, or selfish uneasiness of mind and action

consequent thereon, may be exerted in two different ways, towards two different classes of persons. We may sin

1. In thought only; and also
2. In act, by word or deed:

And these are the two different ways of sinning by envy. We may sin, also, in the social relations of life,

1. Against those beneath us;
2. Against those above us; and
3. Against those on an equality with ourselves:

And these are the three different classes of persons against whom we may sin by envy.

Although both the ways of sinning by envy must be considered, it is proposed to neglect two out of the three classes of persons who are the objects of the sin,—our worldly superiors and inferiors. For, in both cases, selfish uneasiness of mind and ensuing activity are the outcome of other deadly sins, which either have been, or will be, discussed in past or future lectures. For example: Envy may beget the sins of pride, or of covetousness, or of anger: pride, in esteeming ourselves of more worth than our inferiors; covetousness, in desiring to possess the lot of our betters; anger, in the contemplation of the good of either, in which we are not personally benefited. But anger, covetousness, and pride form the subject-matter of other lectures. Our

attention, therefore, in regard to envy will be confined to the case of our equals in life.

In the case of our equals, indeed, it would seem that envy, pure and simple, holds its own undisputed sway. For mental disquietude at the good of our equals in life, and the issue of such want of peacefulness, is envy undiluted by any qualifying circumstances. In such development of deadly sin, anger need take no part; for the dignity of self-consciousness might be lowered by an exhibition of this weakness. Covetousness need not be excited; for it is more than possible to envy without being desirous to share, much less to supersede. And pride need feel no wound; for in the case of equals, the worship of self would not be intermitted, and even might not be questioned. Envy, therefore, envy in thought, or word, or deed; envy as distinct in its effect from pride, from covetousness, from anger; envy, as a capital or root sin, has to be contemplated in relation to those on an equality with ourselves.

Here, again, I am forced to make another limitation; for the subject, even in its contracted form, is too wide for complete treatment in a single lecture. The capital sin of envy, as we have seen, may be exercised either passively or actively. We may indulge envious thoughts; we may act enviously either in word or deed. The deeds which may ensue from stimulated envy are, in number,

legion. They could hardly be mentioned in the time at our disposal. A deed of envy, in the typical case of the high priests, included, directly or indirectly, nearly every conceivable form of sin. It culminated in suicide by the human agent, and in the deicide of the Divine object, of this deadly sin. But short of this cardinal instance of envy, the sin may lead to many lesser crimes than self-murder and the death of GOD. For instance: We may envy a man his position, so far as at once to deprive him of his position, and his position of him. We may envy a man his influence, and spare no pains, till we have diminished, if not destroyed it. We may envy a man his wealth or possessions, to the extent of making it or them our own. We may envy him from personal motives, and come to hate him, or make others hate him. We may envy him his good name, and steal it away from him; or his friendships, and turn his friends into enemies. We may envy his good deeds, and attempt to thwart them; or his abilities, and seek to hinder their usefulness; or even his character and parts, and deny him pleasures which are his due, and gratifications which it would be kind in us to allow him to enjoy. In these and many more ways, envy in act and deed may be called into being. But with these cases, we have, on the present occasion, nothing to say. We will confine our attention to two

points: first, to the passive form of the sin of envy in thought; secondly, to the active form of the sin of envy in word. In both kinds of envy, remember, we shall consider the sin as exercised against our equals in life or society. The first sort of envy, I take to be what theologians call malice. The second, I shall treat as the sin of detraction.

II.

Of all the forms of deadly sin, perhaps the form which is the least loveable before GOD, and most hateful to man, is that of envy aggravated by malice. Intemperance, indeed, lowers its votaries to equality with, or rather, below the level of GOD'S animal creation; and sloth is a sin with few compensating qualities to commend it to a Christian. But, there is a pride which is endowed with an element of nobility. We may be angry, as the Apostle says, and sin not. Some possessions may lawfully be coveted for their higher use to the greater glory of GOD, as S. Paul commands. And the last of the seven deadly sins has a mysterious and intimate connection with the chiefest of the Christian virtues. But it is otherwise with the form of envy which we have now to consider. Malice is the lowest in the scale of wickedness; it is the meanest and most despicable of vices. It almost deserves the epithet of

devilish: for no sin gives us closer relationship to, or places us so nearly on a level with, the great lost spirit than the sin of envy.

Is this an exaggerated statement? Consider the position of Satan in regard to man. Until the day of doom, the devil exists in an atmosphere of envy. And how does such envy manifest itself in human affairs? In many ways. Satan envies the work of GOD'S HOLY SPIRIT, Who renews to man's soul, in baptism, the forfeited gift of supernatural grace. Every child brought to the font is a separate and additional source of envy to the enemy of our salvation. He envies, again, the sprinkling of the precious Blood on sin-stained souls, and their cleansing restoration in the sacrament of absolution. Every adult who kneels before the crucifix in confession is an object of still fiercer envy to our ghostly foe. He envies, again, the showing forth the LORD'S death, as in this church, day by day, till He comes the second time, in the most holy Sacrament of the Altar. Every man or woman who approaches with bended knee to receive the Body of our Incarnated Master is the cause of Satan's keenest, bitterest envy. And observe, my Brethren, that in these three cases, in communion, in confession, in baptism, man gains nothing which his envier loses. The last is incapable of benefiting, desires not the benefit of, and would not

if he could benefit by, the gifts with which the first is blessed. Yet, the devil envies the work of the Blessed TRINITY in man's soul, envies the mercy of the FATHER, envies the outpouring of CHRIST'S precious Blood, envies the sanctification of the COMFORTER, envies the good of souls enriched through the sevenfold channel of the Sacraments of the Church.

Neither is it otherwise with the envious man, who is the victim of a malicious heart under the influence of deadly sin. It matters not, that he is powerless to enjoy the good which GOD, in His bounty, bestows upon another. It matters not, that he wishes not, and cares not for, and perhaps even dislikes, the gift which yet he will not cease from envying. It matters not, that nothing is taken from him, that he is not impoverished, in order that his neighbour may be endowed. It matters not, that his own capacity for enjoyment might be enhanced, that something might be added to his own stock of happiness, if he would only be loving and sympathetic instead of uncharitable and unkind. But he is envious. He is inordinately and selfishly uneasy in his mind at another's good. And this sin it is which brings even regenerated human nature into such fearfully close contact, into such hateful companionship with the spiritual nature that is Satanic.

Malice, as the passive form of the spiritual side of the sin of envy, is well defined in the terms already employed. It is uneasiness of mind—inordinate and selfish—at the good of another: that other being our equal in the world; such uneasiness being confined to mental irritability. And here, I think, the theory which we endeavour to apply to all the capital sins, comes into play in the case of malice. Self being the source and origin of human sin, and the deadly sins especially, being the development of selfishness—is malice, I ask, my Brethren, an exception to this law? In some cases, it may be admitted, the parentage is not easy to discover. In some cases the descent is not easy to trace. But a little trouble and some patience will serve to show us the solution of the mental problem; and the adhesion of the case of malice to the general law of sin will become clear. For, self does lie at the foundation of envy, however much self-deception may hide the truth; and the malicious man is essentially a selfish one. Does any person doubt the truth of this assertion? Consider, again, for a moment, the terms of the oft-repeated definition of the mortal sin of envy, of which malice is only one development—uneasiness of mind at another's good; and then, make an attempt to analyse the definition.

On examination, we find that the situation in which

the envious man places himself, is composed of four distinct factors. There is, first, GOD Who bestows the good. There is, secondly, the good thing itself. There is, thirdly, man who benefits by the good. Lastly, there is self. No further relationship need enter into the question. Any other relationship would complicate it. It is complete as it stands. When, therefore, another's good is offered to the envious man's imagination, self, the last factor, bears a certain affinity to the other three: 1. to GOD, 2. to GOD'S gift, 3. to GOD'S image. We will for the instant, and only for the instant, take the envious man's position and consider these affinities in order. 1. The good conferred upon another alters no relation which before existed, between oneself and GOD. GOD is not changed to us-ward; we are not changed towards GOD: and so far as we are concerned, He is free to give, or to abstain from giving to another. 2. Neither is our connection with, or dependence upon the gift bestowed either altered or reversed. The gift was not ours before it was conferred of GOD: it certainly is not ours after it has been conferred on man. The gift was not intended for our use; and we are not made poor because another is made rich. 3. Nor, again, is the recipient of GOD'S bounty altered in his attitude towards us. He was independent of us before, he is independent of us after,

GOD marked him for special favour. We, certainly, are none the worse; it is possible that he may be none the better, for GOD'S blessing. Hence, in regard to GOD'S gift to another than self, the relationship between self on the one part, and GOD, the gift and our neighbour, on the other part, are unaltered. If, then, we feel inordinate and selfish uneasiness of mind at another's good; and if three out of the four factors of the product are unaffected in their connection with us, the cause of such want of peace and rest must of necessity be sought in the last component element. And that element is self.

Self, then, is the source and origin of malice. And how does malice exhibit its uneasiness of mind? Malice shows itself in too many ways to be summarized; yet some features in its effects may be noted. Selfish uneasiness of mind first of all takes shape in negations. It feels unsympathetic, unloving, ungenerous towards another's good. But it seldom is content with a negative posture, and quickly assumes a positive sensation towards the matter in question. From a want of generosity and love and sympathy, the malicious man becomes displeased with the good of another. He is put out, to use a common term; and feels saddened, out of sorts, out of humour, soured. Perhaps he degenerates yet further, and is annoyed, vexed, irritated,

excited to the edge of explosion—and only to the edge under this phase of envy, which you will remember, represents the passive side of the sin. Later, on the downward slopes of wickedness, the malicious man becomes hard and bitter: bitter towards GOD; hard towards man. He is offended and morally scandalized —wherefore, it would be difficult for him to say; offended, with no tangible ground for offence; offended almost nigh unto death. And he eventually comes even to hate that good thing which another has received, to hate that other who has received the good—it is well if he hate not the Giver of the good to the other. Such are a few of the notes of malice.

Take some common-place examples. Take for remark or analysis four forms of envy—1. emulation, 2. rivalry, 3. jealousy, and 4. discontent.

1. In this age of mercantile activity and mechanical invention, and of the application of the one to the other, A, we will suppose, employs fresh means for providing or multiplying the necessaries of life; or he adapts well-known materials to little-known results; or again, he discovers overlooked virtues in otherwise neglected substances, of high economic value; or once more, he multiplies power and diminishes labour by doing some things quicker or some things better or more surely than before. The invention, the discovery

the adaptation, the employment, opens a new line of business, secures a large custom, becomes a success. By his sagacity A makes his fortune. Self, on the other hand, in the person of B, we will again suppose, self lacks the ingenuity to patent a new mechanical design, lacks the talent to create a new channel for capital or labour; yet feels uneasiness of mind at A's success, which he desires to emulate. Such selfish uneasiness of mind in emulation at another's good is malice.

2. Conceive the case of two other persons, C and D. C, we will imagine, achieves distinction in literature or art, in science, in law or medicine. His skill or eloquence, his research, his picture, or his book, as the case may be, excites attention. It is widely noticed in the public papers; it is eagerly discussed in private circles; it becomes the basis of extended inquiry; it becomes an authority in cases of danger or difficulty—in each case respectively. And C gains credit, fame, position, wealth by his eminence. Self, in the person of D, appears on the stage. D also writes, but badly; and paints but ill. D also studies, though without much advantage to himself or others; and practices, though without many clients or patients. And D is offended at C, and holds himself to be injured. He thinks all praise that falls to another, in his own special

vocation, to be taken from himself. He thinks all success which attends the efforts of another, to be the measure of his own failure. He feels uneasiness of mind at the good fortune, or the deserved reputation of C; and desires to rival him. Such selfish want of peacefulness of mind in rivalry is malice.

Again: 3. Family relations prove a fruitful source of the sin of envy. E, we will say, has a favourite sister, a child he loves devotedly, a parent who is nearly everything to him, a friend who may become all in all. E has a perfect right, if it be a right; E has prefect liberty, if it be only a privilege, to dispense his love towards whatever persons and in whatever proportion he pleases, so long as he injures no one, and hurts the sensibilities of none, willingly. F, however, thinks otherwise. Self, he declares, has equal rights and higher claims upon E's love than either friend or parent, than either child or sister. He resents, as a personal injury, the bestowal of all love which is not directed upon, which is not centred in himself. He is powerless to perceive the boundless capacity of even human love. He cannot believe that love is multiplied rather than diminished by division; that love is strengthened rather than weakened by expansion. He heeds none of these truths; but lets the sentiments of the natural man take their course.

He becomes in turn unsympathetic and ungenerous, displeased and saddened, full of vexation and bitterness, and at last, of hatred both of the loving and the loved. In fact he is jealous. And all such selfish uneasiness of mind in jealousy is malice.

Once more: 4. G is a man without any special connection with ourselves, whose place in the world lies altogether outside our own line of life. He is talked about, written to, heard from, thought of, by others. He exerts an influence, personal or social, to which it would be absurd for us to aspire; and is a man of mark, with few or many admirers, as the case may be. It is even possible that he is noticed by one whose favour we would rather not enjoy; is given what we either do not want, or could not utilise; is commended, whether he deserves it or not, and placed in a position we could not fill; is entrusted with work we should fail in attempting; or attains the object of his wishes, hopes and labours, such attainment being far distant from anything conceived by ourselves. Such is G; and as G is, so H, in the person of self, pronounces against him—why, we will not pause to inquire. But H feels uneasiness of mind at G's vocation in life, at G's response to GOD'S call, with uncharitable discontent. And once more, all such selfish want of peace in discontentedness is malice.

These present a few examples of inordinate and selfish malice; of envy which has its origin in self, which has its fulfilment in the various forms of malice above named, emulation, rivalry, jealousy, and discontent, with which we are familiar—familiar either in others or in ourselves. Nor would further examples be hard to find from everyday life, in home life, or public life; in the office, or house of business; in the workshop, or at the counter; in the school, or in the parish; amongst persons living in the world, or out of it; with priests and people; in both Church and State. These cases, however, are confined to one development only of envy, to the positive side, to malice in thought, to mere uneasiness of mind—though inordinate and selfish—at another's good, apart from action. But the sin of malice seldom retains its earliest impression. Its law of existence almost necessarily implies a law of expansion: in practice entirely so. Thought gives birth to energy: and energised thought, as we have supposed, takes form in word. In the next place, therefore, we have to consider that development of envy which we know as verbal detraction.

III.

The saints have ever been strict with others and severe with themselves on the sin of detraction. S.

Teresa declares of herself, that even during the time when she led an imperfect life, GOD gave her a special aversion from such sin. "I did not speak ill of any one," she says, "and my ordinary custom was to avoid detraction; for I always bore in mind that I should never wish to say anything of anyone, which I did not wish should be said of me. This I paid attention to on all occasions." Among various resolutions which another devout religious made, in order to advance in holiness, was this: "I will never inform myself," said she, "of the faults of others; and when I am forced to speak of them, I will do it in the charity of the Sacred Heart, considering whether I should be well pleased if others said the same of me." S. Bonaventure gives us a good rule to prevent detraction: "When you perceive anything in another worthy of blame, turn your eyes inwardly on yourself; and if you find that you are guilty of some fault, pronounce that sentence upon yourself which you would have passed upon your neighbour." S. Bernard teaches us the same lesson by an opposite method: "When you perceive in your neighbour anything that pleases you, see if you possess the same. If you have it, think how you may preserve it. If you have it not, endeavour to acquire it." By this means you will avoid the temptation of seeing evil in him, and of falling into the sin of detraction.

Again: there is no sin in condemning an action obviously bad; yet is there virtue in endeavouring to excuse our brother: and thus, S. Bernard says in words we know, though we may not know whence they come: "Excuse the intention, even if you cannot excuse the action." And again: "If the same temptation came upon me," said the saint, "or had GOD permitted Satan to have the same power over me, what might not have happened?" And S. Ignatius, when an action was so evidently bad, that there was no way to excuse it, was wont to suspend his judgment, by adhering to the words of Holy Scripture: "Judge nothing before the time. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth."

Strange and terrible stories are on record of the violent and supernatural deaths which have happened to those guilty of the sin of detraction; and of one who, in a frenzy which preceded his death, mangled with his teeth the organ of speech by which he had sinned. There is also on record the case of a holy man who supernaturally received power to fall into a deep sleep when backbiting was resorted to in his presence. But these may not be edifying to mention more definitely. The practical efforts, however, of a certain saint to punish and check the fault in others will bear repetition. She held the office of mistress

of novices in a religious house for women; and was wont to impose severe penances on old offenders in the sin we are considering. As a preventative to the sin, she always recommended her spiritual children to speak little of their neighbours even in commendation; for she said: "We begin by speaking good, and end by speaking evil;" and she would allow them to say nothing in the absence of others which they would not say in their presence. When, however, a novice had been guilty of detraction, even in a slight degree, the saint did not permit her to enter the conventoratory that night until she had acknowledged her fault in the presence of others, and, as a penance, had made with her tongue the sign of the holy cross on the ground; whilst, if the fault were more serious, she made the novice prostrate herself, and the others to place their feet upon the member guilty of detraction, or to inflict three stripes of conventual discipline.

IV.

There is no doubt but that the descent from passive to active envy is as facile as it is fatal. From the thought to the word is only a step; though for detraction to be the outgrowth of mental uneasiness, is a serious declension in the path of godlessness. Un-

easiness of mind is under the command of self. Action consequent thereon is beyond human control. The malicious thought may be forgiven, and injures none but the unhappy subject of it. The act of maliciousness, be it word or deed, leaves its influence behind until the last great day. And this is one reason why sins of the tongue are not only so dangerous, but also of such magnitude. A word once spoken, like a deed once done, passes beyond our power of recall. It is an act performed once and for ever. It cannot be, as if it had never been uttered. It may be repented by the speaker. It may be forgotten by the hearer. It may be forgiven of Almighty GOD. But it cannot be unsaid. Its effect may never leave us this side the grave. Its remembrance will certainly come to us on the other. The word spoken is noted in GOD'S book. And if, my Brethren, for every idle word that men shall speak, we shall have to give an account in the day of judgment, by thy envious and malicious words shalt thou be condemned, O thou detractor of thine own mother's son!

Detraction, in word of course, follows the fourfold division which marks malice in thought. It may be envy in the disguise, 1. of emulation, 2. of rivalry, 3. of jealousy, 4. of discontent. Of these four forms, I purpose to neglect the first three, and more directly

vicious forms of envious detraction, and to consider the last only and least heinous.

We need not seek to emulate our neighbour in mercantile transactions or mechanical invention, and second our efforts by depreciating his. We need not be forced perhaps into actual rivalry with a friend in letters, science, or law, and strive to lower his fame by extolling our own. We need not be the hateful slave of domestic or social jealousy, and basely endeavour to diminish the love of another for a third, by vainly attempting to increase it on behalf of ourselves. It is enough, that we feel in general terms, discontented with some other; that we feel sore, ungenial, out of humour, depressed towards him; and that such discontent finds at once outlet and expression in some word of disparagement. Such disparagement may be truly called the sin of detraction.

Now the sin of envy in the detraction of discontent at another's good, may take at least three forms:

1. It may be direct.
2. It may be indirect.
3. It may be, what I will term, gratuitous.

We will discuss each form with brevity.

I. The direct form of detraction is the more generous

and open kind of depreciation, if there be any openness, or if there be any generosity in the matter. It goes straight to the point, and has the advantage of boldness to gain its purpose. The positive detractor thinks ill of his neighbour, and says so; wishes evil to his neighbour, and says so. He thinks his neighbour undeserving of the good that befals him, and desires all others to concur in such opinion. He wishes that his neighbour were deprived of the good he enjoys, and desires others to join in the effort of deprivation. And whatever the detractor thinks or wishes, he says. Why was so and so, he inquires, of all men destined by GOD, or chosen by man, for this benefit? What has such an one done to deserve it? How will society at large, or his immediate friends, or even himself, be made the better by his enjoyment of it? His parts and talents do not point him out as fitted for such distinction; and those qualities which would have helped him most, he wants. His faults, not to say his vices, are too glaring to escape observation; and those failings which tell most against his interests, he indulges. His position in life does not entitle him to expect what has befallen him; and some less complete good would have more than compensated him for what he has actually done, have been more suitable to his own needs, and more in accord with

the judgment of his friends. Such are specimens of the form of detraction delivered with all the frank candour of envious criticism, which—if we may personate the vice—distinctly challenges his neighbours' claim to good fortune.

II. The indirect method of detraction is more diplomatic than the direct. It fails to attack its opponent openly, but approaches the stronghold of his fame by covered ways. The detractor is conscious that it is labour lost to question the genuine qualities, or to ignore the sterling merits of his unsuspecting enemy. Both are safe from the breath of calumny, because too obvious to be maligned. He would not only fail to convince men of his own estimate of some other, but would cover himself with ridicule in the attempt. There is, however, another plan of operation which indirect malicious detraction can take. There is nothing absolutely perfect in this world, the envious man thinks: every thing, every person, every gift or quality, is good or bad relatively. Even if such an one is positively commendable in himself, it does not at all follow that he is incomparable with others. So the fellow-creature, the co-religionist, the brother in CHRIST, is forthwith subjected to systematic detraction by a series of unfavourable comparisons with

his neighbours. He is placed in the scale of the detractor's balance and found wanting. It may be true, that A, B, or C, is deserving of the good which has come to him; but how many others are deserving also, and to a larger extent! How much more humble is D under the like circumstances, or more diligent, or more patient, or more persevering! How much better would E exert his influence, use his talents, spend his money, employ his time! How much more fitted is F, both by nature and grace, both by endowment and acquisition, both by family and connexion, to fill so high and important a social position! And so may the detractor continue his malicious comparisons to the end of the alphabet, not valuing him who is the object of it directly on his own merits; not honestly estimating him on his own deserts: but always indirectly and meanly comparing him with some other who is avowedly his superior in certain points; always suggesting, if not making the observation, Why was such a gift squandered on one so utterly unworthy?

III. The method of detraction which is at once most indirect in form, and most direct in effect, is the method which I have called gratuitous. Perhaps this form of feeling selfish uneasiness at another's good is more

commonly expressed in two ways—first by suggestion, and secondly by innuendo.

1. First take the case of detraction by suggestion. Suppose a man to be beyond the reach of direct detraction, or beyond the detractor's power of injuring him by this means. Suppose him to be, in his own line, incomparably the best man in the best place, and thus, above the influence of indirect disparagement—it is evident, in this case, that he is capable of being wounded in his reputation most effectually, through the instrumentality of malicious suggestion. And so the detractor shapes his diabolical attack. He fully admits, nay, he is eager to avow, in order to sharpen the point of his weapon, that the object of his envy, on the whole, is an admirable person; that he fully deserves whatever good may have come to him; that he, the detractor, wishes him well from his heart. But then—in the interest of truth, for the sake of society, to prevent misapprehension, and for many other reasons, equally good or equally bad, do not you think, says the envious man, do not you think that such an one is ——? And then follows the suggestion of detraction, which we need not be at the pains to indicate in other than general terms.

Is the victim valued as a public man? You hear that his family relations are unhappy? Is his worth

apparent in private life? You are told that in public he is unbearable. Does he give largely in alms? Yes; but his name and abode appear in subscription lists. Does he give liberally without ostentation? Doubtless; but his poor wife and children suffer untold privations. Has he much time at disposal for works of mercy? It were better, says the detractor, if he attended more to his worldly business. Has he become absorbed in work to which he has been trained? It is a pity he can find no time for GOD'S poor and CHRIST'S little ones. He is remarkably upright; but then his temper is so bad. He is blessed with a sweet temper; but his vanity is undisguised. He is pure, but indevout; active, yet fussy; just, even if harsh; truthful, though severe. Indeed he would be perfect, so says the envious man, were it not for certain failings which he cannot conceal, and for certain faults which his friends cannot overlook. And thus the detractor gratuitously suggests away the character of one whom he dare not indirectly defame, whom he cannot directly injure.

2. Nor is the man who indulges in innuendo less ingenious a detractor, only he says less, and leaves more to the imagination. He deals little with details, but much with generalities; and the more he can convey in the fewest words, the greater he counts his success. Not only does he not either directly or indirectly assail

a man's character, but he hardly ventures upon a suggestion to his detriment. Rather, he envelops his detraction in a vague mystery which he makes no effort to solve, and hides it in a thick cloud of uncertainty of his own composing. He listens, it may be with becoming patience, or even interest, to the praises of the object of his envy; and then, as it seems, almost unconsciously, lets fall the innuendo which becomes the death-blow to his neighbour's fair-fame. Of one he will say: You would not suppose that so holy a person could be subject to such and such an infirmity. Of another: He has wealth, doubtless, and uses it well; but did you ever hear how he made his money? Of a third: The story which I have been told of him, I entirely discredit; but I tell you what I hear, and you must judge for yourself. Of a fourth: He is a most charming person, and I like him immensely; but is he sincere or dependable? Of a fifth: If we only believe one half of what is said of him, he cannot be quite so good as he seems. And so, the miserable innuendo spreads venom-like through the system of society, leaving all smooth upon the surface. It poisons the blood of a man's repute without observation, until it reaches some vital part. And the victim suddenly awakes to find his character utterly blasted.

To these descriptions of the various forms of envious detraction, I will add, further, but two short observations. First: That, of course, it is not needful, in order to be guilty of the sin of detraction, that we should employ the very words I have used as indicative of the sin, or that we should be influenced by the very sentiments which I have supposed. Indeed, the envious man himself may not be conscious of the mental operation examined, nor capable of the vocal utterance described. It is enough if the word spoken, it is enough if the thought conceived fall far short of these examples; but it is not unwise occasionally to estimate the extremes to which moderation in sin may lead, to which moderation in sin does lead. Secondly: That it may be necessary, sometimes and under certain contingencies, to use words of warning to others about third persons, which, if spoken under the influence of the sin of envy, would be justly chargeable with detraction. The motive in such a case, not the utterance, is the test of detraction, is the token of brotherly love. And we have been considering, my Brethren, not the virtue but the sin.

V.

In conclusion, I will summarise, in a few words, a portion of what has been said, that we may have some

definite thoughts to take away with us. After obtaining a definition of the deadly sin of envy sufficiently exact for our purpose, we saw that envy possessed both a positive and a negative side; the first a matter of feeling, the second a matter of action. We then observed that envy may be exerted towards our superiors, our equals, and our inferiors; and this in two ways, either in word or deed, actively; or in thought, passively. Of these two different kinds of envy, excited by three different classes of persons, we have considered the case of envy towards our equals—passive envy in thought, that is, malice; and active envy in word, that is, detraction. Then, we illustrated malice under a fourfold division, of emulation, of rivalry, of jealousy, of discontent. And lastly, we spoke of detraction, direct and indirect, as well as of the detraction of suggestion and innuendo. We have also seen reason to affirm of the deadly sin, from analysing the factors which compose the situation in a simple case of envy, that self is the source and origin of the sin.

It only remains to affirm of envy, that it follows the law which may be observed of the other deadly sins—that the sin can only be subdued by the cultivation of divine love. If envy be a form of love distorted, and if a distortion of love leads, as we have seen that it leads, by thought to word and deed, to loving ill and

loving evil to those whom we should love as ourselves, that is our neighbour; if distortion of love leads, as we have seen that it leads, to desiring another's destitution, because we esteem our own power to be lessened by another's good—such distortion of love can only be counteracted by love which is perfect and divine. We learn from the example of the chief priests to what extremes of deadly sin envy has led others and may lead us—even to suicide and deicide. Let us learn from the apostle S. Paul, that brotherly love is the antidote to the poison of inordinate, envious selfishness; for charity envieth not.

A. M. D. G.

LECTURE FOUR.

ON THE DEADLY SIN OF ANGER:

THE THIRD SIN OF LOVE DISTORTED.

"*Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, 'Thou shalt not kill.' . . . But I say unto you, 'That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment.'*" S. MATTHEW V. 21, 22.

I.

THE deadly sin of Anger, in the distorter of love who is actuated by developed selfishness, causes a man in a third way to love ill or to love evil to those whom he should love as himself, that is, his neighbour. If because of harm done to himself, in fact or imagination, intentionally or by accident, in word or deed, he inordinately and selfishly desires another's injury, a man is said to be actuated by the capital sin of anger. The sin, therefore, stands third in order in the catalogue

of the deadly sins; and is the last of those sins which are the issue of love distorted, in hateful succession first to the sin of pride, and secondly to the sin of envy.

Anger, when it attains the proportion of a deadly sin, may take at least three distinct forms, and may be estimated in at least three different ways. The three forms which the sin of anger may assume, under the influence of developed selfishness, it is hardly necessary to say, are these:

1. Anger in thought;
2. Anger in word;
3. Anger in action.

Perhaps, if our attention to the subject has not been specially taxed, the three ways in which the deadly sin may be estimated are not so familiarly known to some of us. They relate

1. To the matter of the sin;
2. To the manner of the sin;
3. To the motive of the sin of anger;

in regard to the results of distorted love, of loving ill or evil to our neighbour. We will treat the subject from both points of view; and will consider firstly, the three methods of estimating the sin; and lastly, the three forms which the sin may take.

II.

Firstly: Theological writers assure us that the deadly sin of anger is, or is caused by, or comes from "inordinate and selfish love of, or desire for revenge." And so far as concerns our neighbour, we may be content to accept the explanation without entering into a defence of it. The more we analyse the mental feeling of anger, the more we examine the instinct which urges the feeling to take outward form in word or deed, the more shall we see that the spirit of revenge, in a wide sense of the term, has taken possession of our soul. Inordinate desire for revenge, therefore, in the selfish distorter of love may be considered

1. In regard to the matter of the injury to another which revenge makes us inflict, or seek to inflict:

2. In regard to the manner of inflicting such injury: and

3. In regard to the motive which excites us to inflict, or wish to inflict such injury.

In each case respectively, the bad intention, the faulty method of execution, the wicked action itself, when we commit deadly sin, are the opposites, in thought or deed, to the virtues of strict justice, of brotherly charity, of Christian meekness.

For example: Anger, or the inordinate and selfish

desire for revenge, is the opposite, in the first place, of strict justice, whenever the person who has caused our anger has not deserved the punishment we inflict or wish to inflict; and this touches the matter of the sin. It is the opposite, next, of brotherly charity when, in the manner of punishment, we make ourselves, as it has been said, both judges and executioners of the injury which we desire to another. It is the opposite, lastly, of Christian meekness when, in our desire for revenge, we punish the offender, not for the good of his soul, but for the gratification of ourselves, and as a salve to our wounded self-esteem; or when we harbour sentiments which eventually lead to other forms of anger: and this affects the motive of the sin. These three methods of going counter to the virtues of meekness, of charity, and of justice respectively, contain within themselves, as the effects of indulged selfishness and of imperfect love, either the germ or the development of deadly sin.

Take these three modes of estimating the capital sin of anger, and consider them in less general terms.

I. Take the matter of the injury.

The sin of anger is incurred and guilt ensues, when the punishment is out of proportion to the fault com-

mitted. It matters not at all, whether the punishment is, or is not, due. If it be not due, that is to say, if we inflict an injury for an offence not given, we sin doubly; first, by wrong judgment, secondly, by action founded on the illusion. Angry persons are apt to be mistaken. Their mistake, however, so far from mitigating their guilt, enhances it. And even though guiltless through the mistake, they are guilty by design, in the infliction of the injury: and he that offends in one point against the law of love, is guilty of all. But, even if the punishment be due to the person who has wronged us, like all other means to an end, physical or moral, it must be proportionate to the offence in order to be perfect. Indeed, it is only punishment, strictly speaking, so long as such proportion is maintained. When the balance is disturbed, it ceases to be punishment; and according to its kind becomes the effect of cruelty or vice, of spite or malice, of passion or hatred. And I use the word "punishment" in a wide sense. It may be applied to thought, or word, or deed. For a fancied, or for an intended slight, one person may be punished by another in many ways; for instance, by refusing to be conciliated, by saying unkind words, by acts of discourtesy. Of course, these different shades of punishment may be intensified, until positive aversion take the place of temporary dislike; until bad language be the result of unkind words;

until acts of personal violence become developed from simple want of courtesy. But we will not contemplate the extremes into which we, Brothers and Sisters in CHRIST, are liable to fall. Suffice it to remember, that by such wicked acts, or hard words, or bitter feelings, a man punishes his neighbour overmuch; injures him in will or deed; loves ill or evil to him; distorts the divine principle of love; indulges deliberate and inordinate selfishness; and is guilty of the sin of anger. And, remember, the bad act which causes the guilt of anger is the opposite of the issues of the virtue of justice.

II. Take the instrument or manner of the injury which one may desire to inflict upon another.

The sin of anger ensues when a man himself willingly becomes the agent of the punishment due to his neighbour. In this case, we may suppose that punishment, in some form, is actually our neighbour's due; that there is no mistaken cause of annoyance on our part; that there has been a real source of provocation upon his. The question then arises—Who is to become the instrument of vengeance upon our neighbour? Without deciding, at the moment, who may be the fit instrument of punishment, shall we personally become our own executioner as well as our own judge,

and it may be added, our own counsel and witness and gaoler?

Suppose a case avowedly extreme, suppose the case of murder. This is an instance, surely, in which we may follow the injunction of the apostle, to be angry and sin not. And that we may be angry in act as well as thought, and in word equally with either, and sin not, the example of our Blessed LORD in the temple teaches us, when, in the language of Holy Scripture, the zeal of GOD'S house had eaten Him up. The fact of sending a fellow-sinner without warning into the awful presence of his Maker, with no preparation in the way of sacraments to meet the judgment of his works, is comparable for wickedness with only one other form of sin, that of suicide. A person, then, we will assume, commits murder upon a parent, a child, a friend of mine. Granting the heinousness of the guilt, am I at liberty to hunt down that murderer to his place of concealment; and if it be in my power, to avenge the murder by the law of retaliation? Putting aside the chance of the murderer, as the more physically powerful, being able to kill me, instead of my killing the murderer, and thus adding to his guilt without taking from my own—will anyone venture to assert such conduct to be justifiable? And yet, we have the sanction of Holy Scripture for the dire

fate of those who shed innocent blood, that by man shall their blood be shed.

Again: Suppose the case of any crime which is not so clearly punishable by GOD'S word, such as speculative dishonesty on a large scale, perhaps within the letter of the law, which makes beggars of the unhappy victims of misplaced confidence. Shall one, who sees his aged parent, his paralytic friend, or the infant in arms suddenly reduced from affluence to indigence, take the law, as it is called, into his own hands, and avenge those that have suffered, upon the head of the dishonest trustee, or fraudulent bankrupt who has caused such suffering? But, apart from the question of being able to take the law into our own hands, which under most circumstances would be impossible, the question of deciding what that law may be offers a preliminary difficulty. Who is to decide what punishment may be sufficient, and yet not too severe, to meet the requirements of some given offence? It would be dangerous to the offender and to society through him, as well as to the victim himself, to place such power in the hands of the sufferer. It would be unsatisfying to the sufferer that the offender, if privately judged, should be judged by other than one personally interested in the punishment. And even if such difficulty be overcome, it would neither be wise nor judicious

to allow each citizen, without the restraints of law, to avenge himself upon his adversary. The same argument will apply to the cases of many sins which are simply not punishable, or are most inadequately punished, by human law, though clearly and deeply opposed to the law divine. Such immunity from, or insufficiency of punishment may be due, either to the infirmity of law-makers, or from the imperfection of the law itself when made. But in either case, and in all similar instances, which may be allowed to be extreme, it is obviously inconvenient that a man himself should be the instrument of punishment for private injuries upon the private instincts of anger.

Observe, Brethren, the law which governs extreme cases, governs also cases which are not extreme. If this be not so, the assumed law is no law at all; and the expediency which permits minor injuries to be expiated by minor punishments, can easily be extended to punishments which are severe for injuries that are deadly—and both by the instrumentality of private agency. Hence, anger, which takes the form of becoming the agent of punishment to his neighbour, is lawful to no Christian man as a private citizen. It is unlawful, not only because such vengeance is lawless in a human point of view; but on the higher ground, that it is opposed to the evangelical law of doing unto

all men as we would they should do unto us. Human corporate authority alone may punish sins which are cognizable by the state. Divine and infallible authority may safely be left to punish sins that are not cognizable by the state. But, in no case may man, as the unit of society, usurp the functions of society at large. In no case may one sinner presume to inflict upon another sinner punishment which, sooner or later, and far more effectually, will fall upon him, by the sentence of the Judge of sinners. To attempt to wield the direct power of GOD Himself, or to assume the delegated powers of GOD'S deputy, the state, is to become criminal in one phase of the deadly sin of anger, in that phase which is opposed to the action of the virtue of brotherly love.

III. Take the motive which suggests the infliction of injury on our neighbour.

This point includes the real issue of the whole question: for the motive covers or excludes the sinfulness both of the matter of the injury, and of the manner of inflicting it. With respect to the injury inflicted upon another, be the punishment never so just, never so equally apportioned to the fault, if we punish a man less for the sake of the offence, and more for the sake of the offender, the motive of the act is bad, and the

act is a sinful act. With respect to the manner of the injury, the motive alone decides whether the infliction of penalty by human authority at our instigation, or the wish for its infliction at GOD'S hands, be sinful or sinless. In either case, if we cause punishment to fall on one who has injured us, merely to gratify some disorderly passion or wicked affection, the motive, again, is bad, and the action is not without sin. In the first instance, a sinful motive causes us to deny the principles of justice, which allow no personal reason to influence the relations between guilt and its atonement even in this life. In the second, a sinful motive makes us ignore the claims of brotherly love, which, though it administer punishment, never employs such an effort without a hope (incompatible with a false motive) for the reformation of the offender. In both cases, the wrong motive ensues from the want of Christian meekness: for meekness teaches us to bear with the injuries of others, and not to seek retaliation however just, and however little opposed to charity. If then, in our dealings with our fellow-men, our motives be bad, we become guilty of a distortion of love; we love ill or evil to those whom we should love as ourselves; we desire another's injury as penalty for harm done to ourselves; and we become guilty, in a most important aspect of the question, namely

in the motive which influences us, of the deadly sin of anger.

Thus much may be said upon the three methods of estimating this capital sin, from its matter, from its manner, and from its motive.

III.

Anger is a sin which, unfortunately, is of so common occurrence that illustrations of its effects are scarcely needed by way of warning. The following story, however, is worthy of repetition as showing the extreme to which the sin may lead us—extreme at once of folly and wickedness.

The physician Galen, when a young child, as he tells us himself, once chanced to see a man who, approaching the entrance of his house, tried to open it in great haste; but, because the key would not act upon the lock, and all his efforts were unavailing, he completely lost his temper and flew into a passion. His face became flushed with rage; he gnashed his teeth; he stamped upon the ground. Then, as if the door was guilty of standing in his way, he began to kick at it like a madman; and next, venting his fury on the key, he was seen to gnaw at it with his teeth like a dog. Nor did his madness stop here. For lifting up his darkened

eyes to heaven, he uttered blasphemies against GOD; as the doctor says, foaming at the mouth and bellowing like a wild beast. The illustrious physician, child as he was, was horror-struck at the sight, and never forgot it. He seemed to be looking not on a man made in GOD'S image, but on one who had lost the divine likeness: and the sight inspired him with such an abhorrence of anger, that he was never seen to give way to passion during the whole course of his life.

By way of contrast to this insane victim of the capital sin of anger, take an example of one who, in domestic life, and by means which are certainly not common, sought after perfection by cultivating the virtue of meekness and forbearance. A certain lady of Alexandria in the fourth century, not less illustrious for her goodness than her birth, asked S. Athanasius for one of the poor widows who were supported on the alms of the Church, not so much to be her servant as to exercise her patience. A widow of a mild character and peaceable disposition was assigned to her, and began to wait upon her new mistress with attention and devotion. But the lady was the less content with her, for the special purpose she had in view—namely, the improvement of her own temper—the more the widow's character was all that could otherwise be desired. So she restored her to the

Church, saying that she was a most excellent woman, but not one of the sort which she wanted. The lady then got another widow, of a different caste—a rough, unpolished, sour, cross-grained creature, so says the account, of the most troublesome character. Having taken her home she laid herself out to treat the new comer with every consideration and kindness. But the ill-tempered woman, instead of showing gratitude for the goodness of her mistress, answered to it only by insult, abuse, and injury. The saintly lady thereupon again called upon S. Athanasius, to tender her thanks for having sent her such an attendant as she desired—that is to say, a person of a most disagreeable character, who gave her continual occasions for exercising the virtues of patience, meekness, forbearance, and love.

My Brethren, let this example teach us, if not literally to seek occasions for the trial of our temper, at least in the spirit of it to bear with such trials as are sent us by GOD, whether we be masters or servants, whether we be employers or employed.

Listen to one more story; and it is worth listening to. It illustrates the value of forbearance in regard to the sin of anger in others. In a manufacturing town in the north of England, a certain church which plays the part which this church plays, as a centre of Catholic teaching and practice in the midst of a neglected popu-

lation, and which we will call S. Paul's, though such was not its invocation—a certain church attracted to divine worship a large number of mill girls. One of these girls was daughter to a father of prejudiced opinion and violent temper. After bearing for a while with ill-concealed discontent his child's submission to the faith of our forefathers, the man forbad the girl to worship any longer in the church. "Father, father," said the child, again and again, time after time, "let me go to S. Paul's," without moving the will of the hard parent. "No," repeated the father, "no: thou dost learn nothing at S. Paul's church." At last, one day, irritated beyond endurance by the perseverance of the girl, the brutal man, after repeating that she learnt nothing at S. Paul's, raised his hand and with a blow felled his daughter to the ground. The child rose up again, spoke not a word, and went her way. But her love for GOD was not to be beaten out of her by a blow from man. Some days after, like a brave English maiden as she was, the daughter again boldly came to her father to make the same petition. Again she was met with the like response, with the like reason. "No, child, no; thou dost learn nothing at S. Paul's." But this time, the girl made answer, and meekly said: "Yes, father, we do learn something at S. Paul's. We learn, when for nothing we

be knocked down, to answer nothing again." Her soft answer turned away the father's wrath: the man was conquered by the girl.

My Brethren, this is a true story. It was told me as a fact by a priest in the late "London Mission"; and though it loses in effect by not being repeated by a northern tongue, it is true.

IV.

Secondly: We will consider the sin of anger as the outcome of inordinate selfishness, which is developed in three forms: 1. in thought, 2. in word, and 3. in deed.

1. In analysing the capital sin of anger in action, we must keep continually before our mind this fact: that the legitimate result of all anger in action is the sin of murder. In truth, perhaps of all the deadly sins, the beginning and the end are found more nearly together, and are more closely allied, in the case of anger than of any other sin. Moreover, the steps which lead from the one to the other are more easy to descend. The sin almost naturally and irresistibly flows from thought to word, from word to deed. And in this peculiarity, anger stands somewhat apart from the other capital sins. The sinful proud may have reasons even more powerful than self-exaltation to conceal his pride.

The envious or covetous man may be the victim of another sin which counteracts or keeps in check his covetousness or his envy. The sluggard, for the hope even of ultimate benefit to himself, may for a time conquer his besetting slothfulness. And the glutton and lustful, for present advantage, may not yield, at least outwardly, to their respective sins. But it is not so with the angry man. It is almost impossible for him, till he has mastered the sin, to hide it. It is almost impossible for him till he has to an extent subdued the sin, to prevent its outburst. No present advantage, no ultimate benefit weigh with him. No other sin acts as a counterweight. Reason is altogether powerless to influence it. Harboured in thought, it inevitably appears in word. Encouraged in word, it seldom fails to appear in action.

If we take the pains to find the rationale of these features in the sin of anger, we shall probably come to two conclusions: 1. that each deadly sin has its own special characteristic: and 2. that the character stamped upon anger is this, that pre-eminently above all sins (if we except, perhaps, the sin of impurity), the principle of the worst development of anger is contained in its lightest form. And that principle, as has been suggested, is murder. Anger, then, in any shape, contains the germ of the fearful sin of murder.

That such is the case the words of our Blessed LORD declare, when, in the Sermon on the Mount, He was pleased not only to reiterate the command "Thou shalt not kill," but also to extend the "danger of the judgment" to "whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause." And the extension of the command was needful when the letter of the Law became fulfilled in the spirit of the Gospel. For, as anger is of the essence of murder, and is murder in thought; so, murder is the sin of anger in deed. The issues of murder are so awful, and the results so irremediable, if not to the agent, at least to the object, both in this and in the next life, that, in order to prevent the sin from attaining its unhealthy but certain development, it is needful to stifle it in its birth.

Deeds of anger, then, find their legitimate result in murder. That such is the case appears from the definition of the sin. For, if anger is the inordinate and selfish desire of another's injury, such inordinate desire is only completely fulfilled by the absolute removal of that other from the sphere of our own existence. It need not be said, that such removal can be accomplished only by the crime of murder. But, short of this fearful consistency in wickedness, anger in deed may become a deadly sin in many ways. For instance: contentions and quarrels and strifes are

common and vulgar forms, which, though they may escape the guilt of murder, yet have a tendency to fulfil such guilt, and actually may incur the charge of deadly sin. Jealousies and rivalries and emulations and envyings offer other forms for thought: and so also do law suits for doubtful rights, or for no rights at all; political disputes which go beyond the legitimate bounds of party contests; social differences, setting class against class, or one individual against another; or family feuds, which are hardly ever continued, even if inherited, without an element of anger. Revenge, too, in countless ways, falls under the head of anger as a sin: and such development of sin may take a refined and polished aspect.

Again: Plans carried into execution for doing to others as we would they should *not* do unto us—such others being those who have injured us—partake, also, of the nature of the sin. And these executed plans need not be positive acts of mischief or violence in person, or property, or character. They may, from a bad motive, seek to discomfit our neighbour in matters even sinful, which nearly affect his interest, his comfort, or his convenience. Thus, an angry man, himself, perhaps, not free from temptation to the same sin, may seek to foil the pride of one, or to disappoint the envy of another, or to baffle the covetousness of

a third; in each case, not for the purpose of benefiting the soul of his adversary, but to gratify his own inordinate and selfish feeling of anger. Nay, the feeling may descend so low in the scale of wickedness, that the angry man may condescend to take the part of the enemy of souls, and become a human tempter to human beings. He may plan seducements for his neighbour. He may scheme, in order to arouse his covetousness. He may plot, to excite his envy. He may boast, or exaggerate, or pretend, or display, to stimulate his pride. And in so doing he does the devil's work, by human agency. But we need not go so far in the declension of sin as this stage of action, in order to find examples of the sin of anger. A hasty blow, an ill-tempered push, and a malicious deed; or the impatient chastisement of little children, the unreasoning punishment of dumb animals, and the more irrational violence sometimes displayed against inanimate creation, as in the case mentioned by Galen—all these examples of want of self-control are more or less connected with the deadly sin of anger in deed.

Here, my Brethren, I pause for a few moments to place before you a thought which has often crossed my mind, as I walk along the streets of this huge city. Few days pass, perhaps, in traversing, not only

the bye lanes, but also the main thoroughfares of London, without evidence, often of an appalling kind, of the extent to which anger exists in our midst. The blasphemy, the foul language, the cruel act, the outburst of passion towards man, or beast, or thing, continually assail our ears or meet our gaze. What are we, as Christians, to do, under such testimony, on any given occasion, of the prevalence of sin? We should do, at least, two things. First: We should offer up a silent prayer for the victim of the sin, and for the victim of the outrage, with an act of reparation to GOD'S offended majesty. Secondly: We should make an act of humiliation for ourselves, owning, that were it not for the efficacy of grace, we might be in the place of the angry man, or worse, and the angry man might be in our place, or better; as well as offer a hearty prayer to Almighty GOD, that the feelings of anger with which we are tempted, may be controuled, before they develope into word or deed which bear plain marks of the characteristics of the capital sin of murder.

2. The sin of anger in word will come home more nearly to many amongst ourselves, than the sin which developes into act. And although such development is less heinous than the other, we must never forget

that, as from the thought comes the word, so, in anger, from the word comes the deed; and that the angry deed contains within itself the germ of murder. To the more violent, if not more common forms of anger in word, I will make but a passing allusion. The fact that such words would not, save under much provocation, or by the utterly sinful, be used in a sacred building, or before our superiors, or in the presence of those we love much or highly respect, is sufficient to mark them as bad words. I here speak of oaths and blasphemies; of ill-sounding words of bad repute; of terms which are not actually profane, or immoral, in themselves, but which bear a strong likeness to the others; of expressions which either convey more than they assert, or are meant by the speaker to do so; of conventional phrases which may be understood in a bad sense; and of many similar words. All such language uttered under the heat of passion, or temptation to anger, is, of itself, of the nature of sin.

But, we need not stop in our examination of the forms of spoken anger at violent language. There is much that does not rise to profane, impure, or passionate words, which in its nature is sinful. How many persons are there, in the main good-tempered, who are apt to fall into the sin of querulousness, acerbity, irritability, and petulance in word, under

slight provocation to anger. Take the last two cases. A friend or relation, we will suppose, says a word too much about a given matter, or fails to say the right word, or says a word too little—and an angry explosion of temper, though it be but a petulant word, is the result. A person, in the best of tempers, begins a conversation with a neighbour; a conversation which takes an unlucky turn, either in politics or religion, or any other equally engrossing subject—and anger in word, from an irritable temper, ensues. An argument is attempted on one's own part, or perhaps is unwillingly forced upon one by another, with every self-determination to keep in good temper. But, bye and bye, our adversary declines to be persuaded; does not see the point of our argument; seeks to persuade us by reasons we cannot answer, though we may know them to be false; or worse, forces upon us facts which we will not allow and cannot deny, for we know them to be true—and again an angry word—irritable or petulant, a sign that our resolution has failed us, escapes.

Even smaller things cause us to employ words of anger; for I will not contemplate things of magnitude, such as disappointment, the loss of friends or money, bad health, mental infirmity, failure in plans, or actual wrong-doing from others against ourselves. Thus: We may feel angered, when our wishes are not instantly

carried out; when they are done otherwise than we wished; when they are not done at all; when they are performed with apparent ill-will or without obvious good-will—and we give way in rebuke, or peevishness of speech. It matters not, that the person who gave offence intended no harm, and did his best to please. It matters not, that he met with an unavoidable accident, that he sincerely meant to avoid annoyance. If only the fatal chord was touched in the soul of the angry man, the sound which proceeded answered to the touch, and the angry word, irritable or petulant, became added to the former sins of the guilty soul.

Again: Take any of the ordinary and small events of life, in act or word, and witness the result in the angry man's uncontroulable gift of speech in the other two forms—the forms of acerbity and querulousness. If one chance to run against another in the street; or if he gets into, or fails to get out of, another's way; or passes too near before him, or jostles too close behind him—an angry word, offspring of angry temper within, is often the unwitting, or even unconscious offender's immediate punishment. Of course, an angry word employed against us, more especially if well deserved, is enough to beget words of anger in return, as surely as echo answers to voice under certain physical conditions of nature; and a sharp word is

sufficient to ensure a snappish retort from the man disposed by acerbity to sin by anger. But, it does not need the words or acts of man to rouse the demon of querulous anger in our heart, and to give it expression in word. The state of the weather—to name a commonplace instance—be it hot or cold, be it dry or wet, provided only that it interferes with our plans of self-seeking, is a fruitful source of complaining, discontented, words of anger against Almighty GOD. And such words are fairly certain to be repeated in kind, and exaggerated in degree, against the first of GOD'S creatures who oppose or thwart us. Whilst, anger is confined neither to GOD nor man in the case of many unhappy persons. For some are so lost to the fitness of things, under the influence of anger, as to employ bad language to dumb animals—as if they could understand it—when following only the law of their creation; and even to inanimate matter—as if it could be influenced by abuse—when it simply obeys the motive power impressed upon it by the angry man himself.

3. And lastly: The sin of anger in thought will come home more closely to most of us, than even the sin which developes into word. And although such development, it may be repeated in this case also, is

less heinous than the last, we must again not forget, that as from the word comes the deed which contains within itself the germ of murder; so, the word spoken in anger is only the product of the angry thought not sufficiently or systematically controuled.

Perhaps the better plan to consider anger in thought will be this—to attempt to analyse in a few words the state of mind, momentary or continuous, in which such a feeling is apt to place us. In this consideration, we may omit all details of the cause of our anger, and confine our attention alone to the effect. We will suppose, then, that some one has offended us; and that we, as a result, are guilty of the sin of anger. How does this result mentally show itself to our inner self?

At first, it may be, though tempted to anger, we are not angry; we hold our judgment in suspense. If charitably disposed, we are not quite sure whether or not any offence were meant; and we give the offender the benefit of the doubt. Still, our mind is all prepared, like the battery of an electric machine, to emit sparks of passion, in word or deed, if our suspicions are well-founded. But, there may be no opening for doubt. The insult was marked and intentional; and we, as carefully and deliberately accept what was offered.

Then our trial begins.

Outwardly, perhaps, we have sufficient command over

our muscles to prevent obvious show of anger. But a match has been applied to the gunpowder, and a report has been heard within our soul which tingles through our nerves. Yet, even outwardly, our countenance, that divinely given—not, observe, Brethren, the humanly developed—index to our emotions, which we know also as 'expression,' may prove tell-tale. The pouting lip or knit forehead, the flushed cheek or sudden palour, the vengeful look, or the kindling eye, may betoken the storm which sweeps within. We positively long to speak. If spoken, the angry word seems to intensify the heat, and to cause the smouldering embers to burst into flame. If silent, we do one of two things: we either harbour the insult; or, by the grace of GOD, we put it far from us. In the latter case, we have gained the chiefest victory, we have conquered ourselves and our besetting sin. We are enabled to laugh it off, to turn the conversation, to distract our attention, to occupy ourselves in some other way, to think of some other matter, or, better still, to offer up the insult to GOD.

But we may do otherwise; and the angry man will do otherwise. We may accept the deed or word, and make it part of ourselves. We may take it away with us, as it were, think over it, and even meditate upon it. We may repeat it to ourselves; we may repeat it

to others. We may anticipate the repetition of it, without any intention on the side of our adversary again to incur our anger. We may act it over and over again—even to a division of the parts—in public and private, by day and night. We may have learnt it by heart so completely, as never to be wholly free from it. The thought will come to us at all odd moments. Our business will hardly keep it from us; and our devotions not at all. Dissipating pleasure alone dispels the unhappy illusion of the angry man, namely, of being made really worse by having been injured. Not that we wish to be revenged. Far from it. As we say, we willingly forgive; but we cannot forget. We have been injured, as a fact: and as a sentiment, we feel it. And in our devoutest hours we are haunted by it, even at GOD'S holy altar.

Neither are these the only malevolent effects of deadly sin in our soul, when anger is consciously encouraged. We are even powerless to see the person who has done us the wrong, or to hear of him, or to read of him, without feeling the wrong he has done us. His very name, or any chance word that brings him to mind, will bring to mind, also, his injury of us. In short, our heart is poisoned by his action: and we are for a time in a state near akin to actual demoniacal possession by the passion of anger. And

nothing will successfully exorcise the demon, but special resolution at the beginning of the day against this feeling of anger; special self-collectedness during the day; and special self-examination in regard to the sin at the day's end, or even twice during the day. Nor will these secondary and indirect efforts against anger in thought avail anything, except they are supplemented, or rather, except they are introduced by sacramental aids: by confession of the deadly sin, to banish it from our soul; by penance, to prevent our forgetting it and for keeping it in check; and by the Holy Communion to implant and increase in our soul the opposite Christian virtue.

V.

In conclusion, this only need be added, in order briefly to summarise certain salient features which may be observed in the third of the capital sins—the last of the sins which owe their origin to love distorted—the sin of anger.

In all that has been said of the sin of anger, I have confined our attention to the thought of deadly sin in different forms and under various conditions. The sin of anger has been viewed in regard to the motive which makes us indulge it, to the manner of indulging it, to the matter of the indulgence. It has also been esti-

mated in reference to its results in thought, in word in deed. The bad intention, the wrong instrument, the wicked action, have also been shown to be antagonistic to the Christian virtues of meekness, of charity, of justice. But, in all these cases, and under every aspect of this form of love distorted, anger has been discussed as a deadly sin. There may be, there are, instances of love distorted which cannot be accounted deadly sin. We may feel angry thoughts, we may say angry words, we may do angry deeds, and yet not be guilty of deadly sin. The matter of the action may not be perfect, and we may offend against justice. The manner of the action may be mistaken, and we may be forgetful of charity. The motive of the action may be questionable, and meekness may be ignored. Yet, in each case respectively, we may escape the guilt of positive deadly sin.

Our concern, however, at the present time is not with sins which are not, but with sins that, in character, are deadly. And enough, perhaps, has been said to indicate some of the more marked features of this capital sin. We have seen that anger is a form of imperfect love—selfish and inordinate—which springs from love distorted. We have seen that the angry man loves ill, or loves evil, to those whom he should love as himself, namely his neighbour. We have seen that,

because of wrong done to himself, he desires another's injury. And we shall have no difficulty to imagine from what has been before said, that inordinate selfishness is the source and origin of the sin; that love perfect and divine is the only antidote; and that he who deliberately encourages, who wilfully utters, and who habitually commits the thoughts or words or deeds of this form of love distorted, is guilty before GOD of the deadly sin of anger.

A. M. D. G.

A THEORY ABOUT SIN.

PART II.

THE SIN OF LOVE DEFECTIVE.

PART II.

THE SIN OF LOVE DEFECTIVE.

LECTURE FIVE.

FURTHER PRIMARY RELATIONS BETWEEN LOVE AND SELF AND SIN.

LECTURE SIX.

OF THE DEADLY SIN OF SLOTH.

LECTURE FIVE.

FURTHER PRIMARY RELATIONS BETWEEN LOVE AND SELF AND SIN.

III. THE DEADLY SINS THE DEVELOPMENT OF SELFISHNESS; IV. DIVINE LOVE THE ANTIDOTE OF SELF-LOVE.

"*A new Commandment I give unto you, 'That ye love one another;' as I have loved you, that ye also love one another.*" S. JOHN xiii. 34.

I.

TWO of the four points in the respective connection between love and self and the capital sins which we, my Brethren, have already considered, are

I. That love is the principle of all human action: and

II. That self is the source and origin of all human sin.

The next in order of the component parts which enter into and tend to complete our position is this:

III. That, consequent on the influence of imperfect love, the deadly sins are developments of human selfishness.

To this third elemental truth, I purpose to confine your attention, in the first place, on the present occasion. And I pray GOD to give us power to work out our theory of the deadly sins to His greater glory, and the good of souls.

II.

The theory of the deadly sins—though the truths enunciated deserve a less equivocal title—by the light of which we may examine some results of sinfulness in daily life, I will remind you, may be shortly stated in this form: that as selfishness is the cause of human sin, so is divine love the cure for selfishness. To-day, then, as a step forward in the argument, I purpose to lead your thoughts first to the question of love that emphatically is not divine, but human; to the question of imperfect love; to its extent over the sins which we call capital; to its subdivisions; and to what degree the various modes of deadly sin are the out-come of developed selfishness. And this examination is the more needful to be now approached, because we have already employed the phraseology of imperfect love, in the terms, distorted love, defective love, and excessive love;

and it is well that we should realise distinctly the value of these terms, in order to obtain a definite idea of the relation which imperfect love bears to love that is perfect and divine. We will, therefore, address ourselves to the point before us, that the deadly sins are the development of personal and inordinate selfishness, consequent on imperfect or human love.

Love, as the motive principle of human action, admits, as we have seen, of these four distinct forms only: 1. the love of GOD; 2. the love of man; 3. the love of created things; 4. the love of self. The first main division of which love is capable, in this relation, is twofold. Love may be perfect, or love may be wanting in perfection. The love of GOD, as GOD; the love of GOD'S image, for His sake; the love of His creation, in regard to GOD—these are three several efforts of love. They are developments of love perfect and divine. The love of self for one's own sake only, or the love of the creature in relation only to self—and I desire to draw attention to the adverb, 'only'—in one word selfishness, is the personation of love imperfect and human. Of these two main divisions of love, our concern at present, in tracing the development of selfishness, will be limited to the latter, to human and imperfect love.

Before, however, we consider the threefold aspect of imperfect love, a few thoughts may be devoted to the term 'selfishness,' with a view to anticipate objections. The word selfishness covers or declares an idea in the less loveable, but widely loved division of our principle of action, which hitherto has been passed in silence. But the question demands examination. The love of self and the love of GOD, have been placed in direct opposition, if not in actual antagonism, as the quotient of the two divisions of love, selfishness and self-sacrifice respectively. On the last subject, that self-sacrifice for the love of GOD is the exponent of the highest form of perfect love, I shall say nothing. It is the love of self, as the exponent of pure selfishness, that requires mental caution in the employment of the words. For the sake of clearness, I use the terms love of self and selfishness, in their popular meaning. And in this sense of the term, the love of self only is the lowest and most degraded form of imperfect love, as the motive principle of human action. But, theologically, we have to make a distinction: and this distinction I have marked by the adverb, 'only.' The love of self only, in our relations to GOD and our dealings with man, is of the essence of selfishness. Yet, the love of self—as the creature of GOD, as one whom GOD wills to be saved, as one who was sent into the

world to save his own soul—in this sense it legitimately enters and was meant by GOD to enter, as one element, into that form of love in action which is perfect and divine. And it enters in the following way.

The salvability of our individual souls, I assume to offer a crucial test of love, whether it be divine or human. The desire of salvation, for the love of self only, may be admitted without hesitation to be, and is, utterly unworthy and selfish in character. The desire of salvation for the love of GOD only, for the greater glory of GOD, without controversy will be allowed to form the highest possible motive in man. But, it does not follow from hence, that desire of salvation for the love of GOD only is the Christian antithesis to such desire for the love only of self. Absolute self-sacrifice and personal selfishness are not co-ordinate terms of opposition in the Christian system of revelation. They do not between them simply exhaust the motives for seeking to attain to bliss. They do not exclude the creation of a composite motive of desire for the Beatific Vision. The love of GOD only is not revealed in Holy Scripture, has not been taught by the Catholic Church, to be the sole motive principle in question. And it does not follow that such motive principle alone is of the nature of that Christian gift and grace which we know as self-sacrifice. To assert

this to be the case, to assert that the love of GOD only is the sole motive for the desire of salvation, may possess its advantages for incisiveness and brevity in expression; but it cannot be commended for accuracy of statement. The definition is more clear than complete. It is more concise than exact. The truth does not lie in such extreme or exclusive statements. It is many-sided; and presents more points of observation than can be postulated in a single well-balanced period.

The desire for salvation, as a catholic virtue, is a composite feeling, the product, in proportions difficult to calculate and needless to discuss, both of the love of our own soul and of the love of GOD. It is no simple and self-contained sentiment expressed by either portion of this formula. It is only complete under the joint influence of both. The desire of bliss is essentially complex in character—essentially, because the Christian belief in the Beatific Vision involves a belief in both GOD and man; a belief that GOD wills both His own greater glory and man's salvation; a belief that GOD wills His greater glory through man's salvation; a belief that GOD'S accidental glory, as divinity teaches, is increased by such a fulfilment, in regard to man, of GOD'S antecedent will of good pleasure.

This, I apprehend, is the judgment of the best

theologians. It certainly is the theory which assimilates itself most closely to the supernaturalised instincts of man. Nor are the mere natural instincts at issue with this opinion. Far otherwise. For, from a Christian point of view, self is no isolated or separate organisation, apart from and independent of the divine influence. Self is rather an incorporated member of a Person, of a Person at once divine and human; a member incorporated to the extent of being made one with CHRIST, and of CHRIST being made one with it; incorporated with the privilege of becoming by sacramental agency, a member of His Body, of His Flesh, and of His Bones. In other words, self is one factor of that mysterious union effected by the Incarnation, the union between the Creator and the creature.

And what position do we attain in virtue of this truth? How may we now view the question between self-sacrifice and selfishness, in relation to the motive influence of salvability? To a Catholic, and speaking theologically, we attain to this statement of truth—that the love of self, as one element in the desire for salvation, means the love of that which is predestined to union with the Godhead, partially through the sacraments here, perfectly in bliss hereafter. Personal desire for salvation, therefore, means the desire for salvation of a member of GOD'S SON; and in conformity with

His will, for union with the Sacred Humanity. And the greater glory of GOD is not diminished, it is enhanced, by the love of the members of His SON for their own Blood-bought souls. Nay, we may say more. We may say, that as GOD created man for His honour, and is pleased to will the union of man with Himself, such union would lack an element of perfection, and such honour would lack an element of completeness, if we failed to co-operate with GOD. And such co-operation is incompatible with self-sacrifice that desires not personal salvation. The love of self, therefore, is only one form of conforming the human will to the Will Divine. It is only placing our eternal interest in harmony with GOD'S sovereign pleasure. Desire for salvation, in conformity with the will of GOD, may be a lawful sentiment for a Christian man; desire, based on the common ground of the love of GOD and the love of our own soul. And, hence, it may be affirmed in this sense and speaking theologically, that there is a love of self which is allied to the love of GOD, there is a love of self which is not common selfishness.

This is a point which it is needful for us to understand clearly and to hold with firmness, that the desire for individual salvation is a composite sentiment, including both the love of GOD and love of one's own soul. But it is not less momentous for us to realise,

it is not less true for us to believe, that the love of self for one's own sake *only*, even in the legitimate desire of seeing GOD face to face, even in the honest wish to fulfil the Creator's intention of union with the creature, is the personation of imperfect love. It is selfishness. And it is in the last and popular sense, not in the strict theological meaning of the terms, that the words 'love of self' and 'selfishness' are used in connection with the capital sins. To the relation between mere human selfishness and our theory about sin, we will now more especially address ourselves.

The love of self only, or the love of the creature in relation only to self, we have agreed to call selfishness. It is the personation of love imperfect and human. And imperfect or human love, in regard to the deadly sins, has been treated, by one of the latest but not least talented commentators of the *Divina Commedia* of Dante (Maria Francesca Rossetti, in her charming volume "A Shadow of Dante," 3rd edition. Rivingtons, 1874), as capable of three distinct evolutions. Imperfect love, or the love of self only, may take

1. The form of loving ill or evil; or
2. The form of loving too little; or
3. The form of loving overmuch.

And the man who indulges in these three forms of

selfishness may be viewed, respectively, as the distorter of love, as the defaulter in love, as the exceeder in love. Bearing in mind, then, our theory about sin, that selfishness is the origin of human sin, we will annotate some of the features of this threefold evolution, in order that our discussions upon the issues of imperfect love, both in the past and in the future, may be made more definite and clear.

We will take the forms of selfishness one by one in the order in which they stand.

1. The distorter of love, as the victim of the earliest development of selfishness, loves evil or ill to those whom he should love as himself, that is, his neighbour. Distortion of love finds an outlet in the first three of the deadly sins, in Pride, in Envy, and in Anger. If, for his own selfish exaltation, as this method has been ably explained, he inordinately desires another's depression, the distorter of love is guilty of the sin of pride. If, esteeming his own power or influence to be lessened, he selfishly and inordinately desires (in theological language) another's destitution, the distorter of love is guilty of the sin of envy. If because of evil done, or attempted, or imagined to be done, to himself, he selfishly and inordinately desires another's injury, the distorter of love is guilty of the sin of anger. This short commentary plainly indicates the position which

distortion of love, the first development of the imperfect love of self only, occupies in the sad scheme of evil which we are investigating, under the name of the capital sins. And this development includes three sins which we have already considered, in the last three lectures, pride, envy, and anger.

2. The second division of selfish or imperfect love, as the motive principle of human action, comprises but one of the seven enemies of man's happiness, the capital sin of Sloth. The slothful man is plainly a defaulter in love. He selfishly loves less than he might love the Highest Good, that is, GOD: and hence selfishly loves more than he ought to love a lower good, that is, himself. Striving after the one all too slackly, the result of seeking after the other all too eagerly, the defaulter in perfect love falls into the deadly sin of Sloth. And the sin of Sloth will be treated in our next lecture.

3. The last form which selfishness, or imperfect love, may take, according to the classification of the old philosopher and poet, Dante, whom we may thankfully follow, includes the three remaining capital sins, Covetousness, Gluttony, and Lust; and these we hope to discuss in three following lectures. He who is guilty of this form of selfishness is called an exceeder in love. The exceeder in love loves more than he ought to love

some lower good outside and beyond himself in created things. If, as a principle of his action, the exceeder in love loves money, or money's worth, overmuch, he is called a covetous man. If inordinately the exceeder in love loves the good things of this life in food and drink, he is called a gluttonous man. If he is the unhappy and unsatisfied slave of sensual gratification, or pleasure, the exceeder in love is called a lustful man.

Thus we see, at one view, the seven deadly sins mapped out before us in their threefold division, both as to their cause and as to their effect. Upon this classification I will offer but a single observation in this place. These seven developments of personal and inordinate selfishness, the varied expression of imperfect love as the motive principle of human action, are respectively antagonistic to those efforts of divine love which have already been named. Thus, to take them in order: the love of GOD, as GOD, is eliminated by the sin of sloth. The love of GOD'S image, man, for GOD'S sake, is weakened by pride, envy, and anger. The love of created things in comparison with GOD is exaggerated by covetousness, by gluttony, and by lust. These facts point to a new relationship, and one perhaps not expected between the deadly sins and divine love. They are suggestive of the truth, that as self is the source and origin of sin, so love is the anti-

dote which counteracts the poison of self. And this truth forms the last component part of our theory about sin.

III.

Having thus shown that imperfect love, in the form of developed and inordinate selfishness, finds expression in the seven deadly sins, we have now to consider the converse of the last proposition, which may thus be stated:

IV. That divine love is the antidote to the poison of human selfishness.

Love is the antidote of self—such is the position we have to discuss. And in this consideration, we will follow the order which we followed in discussing the co-ordinate proposition, that self is the origin of sin. We will begin by taking a general view of the question, and will then pass somewhat more definitely into particulars.

Without entering into details, think for a moment, my Brethren, thus: When we witness or hear of any decided act of kindness to our neighbour in word or deed; any act which may be classed under one of the seven bodily or spiritual works of mercy; any act which is the issue of a deadly sin stamped out of the life; any act which is a result of the opposite virtue: what do we

say or think of such an act, and the actor of it? If we are blessed with the presence of the love of GOD in our hearts, if we possess even a spark of sympathetic generosity, do we not judge such an one to be eminently unselfish; do we not declare of such an act, that it is obviously an unselfish act? Are we not confident that, in some form, love is the mainspring of the act, and enters largely into the actor's being? Are we not sensibly drawn towards such an one, though we may be personally unknown to him; and do we not desire a share in the overflowing of his love?

Again: When we hear of or witness some act of passive endurance, some word of enduring patience; when we listen to the soft answer that turneth away wrath, or listen in vain for any answer which would kindle wrath: what is our mental judgment, if not our spoken verdict? Again: When we observe the self-command which takes it patiently when one does well and suffers for it, or which offers the other cheek, after the one has been smitten; or when we note the endurance which lets him have the cloak also who at the law has taken away one's coat, or which is willing to go twain with him who has compelled a journey of one mile: again, what is our mental judgment, if not our spoken verdict? Are we not persuaded in both cases, that these endeavours after the imitation of CHRIST are

the result of human selfishness subdued, are the outcome of divine love encouraged and cultivated in the soul? Do we not feel instinctively—if the words or acts which drew forth these evidences of the supernatural life had their source and origin in the love of self—that the antidote to the poison of human selfishness must be sought in the influence of love which is divine and perfect?

Take an example from a low level in the workings of divine love, yet from one in which love may shine with equal power, though with less radius than on a higher level of spiritual life. Suppose, in the presence of a third person, that another gives utterance to a false report of some absent friend; or mentions a story which is not false, but may be, in part, only too true, which tends to defame his neighbour's character. And suppose that we, standing by, hear the third person attempt to qualify such statement; to suggest that the absent one is not so bad as he appears, or is reported, to be; to hint that the whole truth, probably, is not known; to affirm, positively, that the whole truth has not been told; or in other ways to give a charitable colour to that which is wanting in charity—what will be our mental judgment, if not our spoken verdict, upon this third person? Shall we not say or think,

What consideration for the aspersed and absent is displayed! How considerate is the man!

I need hardly remind you, Brethren, that consideration for others means forgetfulness of self. The considerate man must be an unselfish man. Is it, then, too much to declare, as was suggested at the outset, that such an one is actuated by the instinct of divine love; that he stands on the platform, even though on a level which need not be high, of the supernaturalised life? And the same observation would be made by the mental analyst, if the object of our estimate had taken the passive, instead of the active line which evidenced his freedom from human selfishness and his obedience to the divine law of love. It would have been just and true to affirm of his case, also, that the poison of self had been counteracted by the medicine of love.

Again: Suppose, on the same low level of spirituality, that we are told of or see, at the hands of another, some little act of kindness; some act without dignity enough about it to be classed as the effect of one of the Christian virtues, but which, when done, certainly predisposes the doer of it to have bestowed upon him the grace of such virtue. Suppose a kind act to be done in a kind manner; or a stern act of duty to be done in a considerate way; or an indifferent act, about which choice

may lawfully be exercised in the doing or not doing, to be actually performed. Suppose, in the manifold relations and intimacies of private and family life, the little courtesies exacted by strangers are habitually and gracefully conceded without compulsion to those with whom we live—little attentions, almost too minute to be mentioned from this place, but not at all insignificant in helping to make or to mar the completeness, and even the picturesqueness, of domestic intercourse between father and daughter, between son and mother, between husband and wife, between brother and sister. What do we think or what do we say of one who thus brings the softening and elevating law of love to bear upon the commonplace incidents of every-day life, but that he is an unselfish being, that he is sensibly actuated by the love of GOD as GOD, and by the love of man for GOD'S sake? And the same would be said, the same would be thought, if passive unselfishness, in the place of active conformity with the law of love, were the subject of social or Christian criticism. The hasty word accepted with a smile, or the hasty deed ignored with composure; the rare but valuable faculty of knowing when not to do and when not to speak, judiciously exercised; the argument or strife kept within the bounds of good temper, or allowed to die out for want of fuel; the obvious bad manners of selfishness—for

there are no such bad manners—made less remarkable by the good breeding of self-sacrifice: these would be declared, and would be rightly declared to be evidences, that a man was under a course of discipline by which human selfishness becomes obedient to the demands of love which is perfect and divine.

Again: Ascend higher by a step in the supernatural life upon earth of divine love. Suppose we are told, or read in the daily papers, of some act of heroism by land or sea, some act of daring under imminent danger to, or sacrifice of life, by fire, by accident, or by storm. Take the sailor, that we heard of last winter, that we hear of, in some form, every winter during the gales which blow upon our savage coasts. Take the sailor—the common sailor as he is called—who trusts himself and some helpless child to an extemporised means of escape from the ship stranded on the shore; who goes first, suspended over the boiling surge on a fragile line, which may not, and eventually does not, bear the strain upon its powers; who ventures first, not selfishly to save his own life, but in the spirit of self-sacrifice to inspire confidence in the passengers committed to his charge. Or that other sailor, of whom we have heard more, and more lately heard, whose vessel, alive with human souls, was cut to the water's edge at the dead of night, when riding in

supposed security within reach of land; the captain, who, in the view of almost certain death, could yet defend the boats from over-crowding by the cowards who prevented helpless women from escape; the captain, whose natural instinct for self-preservation was not so strong as to prevent his caring for others rather than for himself, even to the last, as his ship went down at anchor. Take the brave pitman from the black country, of whom we also read in the winter—of whom we read almost year by year, under one name or another—after some awful explosion in a coal mine, which has sent into eternity for judgment his friends and relatives; the pitman who volunteered—volunteered, mark you, my Brethren, for it was not his duty—to descend the fatal shaft in order to succour those that may have escaped suffocation, or burning, or sudden death; the pitman, who is lowered beneath the surface only to be drawn up again the victim of the fate from which, by self-sacrifice, he attempted to save others. Or, take the fireman, whose duty, in the manifold subdivisions of human labour, we may affirm it to be, to assist in the extinguishing of fires; the fireman who performs such duty beyond the requirements of mere paid service, who imperils his own life that he may save the lives or property of others, or exposes himself to danger, perhaps, in order to save the things of GOD.

Take any one of these cases, and say if you do not instinctively realize the existence of self-forgetfulness, self-abnegation, self-abandonment in the conduct of these brave men. I have quoted these cases as instances taken from the supernatural life; and have done so advisedly. For, it matters not that the hardy sailor, the determined collier, the intrepid member of the fire-brigade, may have been, perhaps were, actuated by a high, manly sense of positive duty, as they held duty. This may be allowed. Such sense of duty, however, at such a time, under such circumstances, rose to heroism, for which we hold these gallant men in loving admiration. But an act of heroism never, or seldom, stands alone, isolated and apart. Almost without exception, it is the culminating point in a course of action which must have been systematic, and may have been life-long. From a Christian point of view, it is due only to an effort of the life which, living above the mere instincts of nature, may fitly be called superhuman. For these men, little as they may have been conscious of the mental process, would never have been capable of making such efforts had they habitually given way to selfishness; had they not been inspired with that form of divine love, however acquired, which at once excites the desire of, and gives the power for self-sacrifice.

Neither does our theory about sin fail, if we consider the heroism of passive fortitude as exhibited now and again even in this self-pleasing century. Take but a few casual instances. Take the case of the Sister of Charity, a lady by birth and feeling; one who in purity possesses the germ of the saintly life; one, perhaps, to whom the sin with which she is forced into contact appears specially hateful, even to abhorrence; one who, for the love of JESUS, takes penitentiary work, and is subjected to the waywardness, the ungovernable temper, the dejection and despair, the undue elation and passionate sorrow by turns, of the fitful inmates of a house of mercy. Take the case of a nursing Sister, highly educated and refined; always prepared to leave her convent life at the call of sickness from poor or rich alike; never hesitating to endure the sights and sounds and other adjuncts unhappily inseparable from the sick room, in the houses of the sick poor; glad to minister to the afflicted members of Him Whose willing handmaid she is thankful to be. Or take the case of the Hospital Chaplain, who in humble obedience to the Catholic custom of receiving the LORD'S Body before all earthly good, deliberately offers to the poisoned atmosphere of a fever ward the fairest chance of his own destruction, and dies—dies a victim to his duty in dispensing to the dying the

Source of life; dies, as men say, prematurely; slain, we Catholics affirm, by the criminal indifference of his Church which does not enforce—I say not permit—the practice which has obtained from the very first, the practice of the Reservation of the Blessed Eucharist.

Take any one of these cases, and ask yourselves, Brethren, whether or not such passive fortitude springs not from that form of divine love which creates the virtue of self-sacrifice, by eliminating the influence of human selfishness?

Will any person venture to question the position, that divine love is the all-powerful, energising, perfecting influence which first attacks and then destroys the empire of human selfishness, whether active or passive, within the soul? Will anyone deny that love is the antidote of the poison of self? If any feel disposed to doubt, let him examine at his leisure the Christian virtues which are the opposites of the capital sins; let him discover their cause, trace their course, witness their result; and then, let him declare what relationship he may discover in the three great terms of the moral problem which we seek to solve, the intercommunion that exists between love and self and sin. Patient enquiry, my Brethren, will discover much more; but it will not fail to place the enquirer face to face,

at least, with these truths. The man who is little in his own sight, by the cultivation of humility; who is never jealous of another's advantage, through the dictates of brotherly love; who is seldom seen to lose his temper, under the discipline of meekness—such a man bears the character of one whose life is instinct with love, of one who has counteracted human selfishness by love divine. The love in such an one is so apparent that it cannot be hid. It is so unconsciously inspiring that it becomes infectious. We long to be allowed to love him. He is one whom we would have to love us.

Now, what are these three Christian virtues, but the opposites of the first three of the capital sins? What are the virtues of humility, of brotherly love, of meekness, but the sin of pride subdued, the sin of envy conquered, the sin of anger controuled? What are these virtues, but counteracting influences which neutralise the principle that underlies distortion of love, the loving evil to those who are to be loved as ourselves, namely, our neighbour? Even this general statement confirms in general terms the theory under examination, that love is the antidote to self. And this general confirmation receives specific support if we test our theory about sin by the definitions already given of the same deadly enemies of the soul. For:

If the proud man for his own exaltation inordinately desires another's depression, not for the glory of GOD, not for the good of souls, not for the benefit of created things, but for the love of self—then, it follows, that the gift which subdues the sin of pride by the cultivation of humility, must cause also the subdual of selfishness from whence pride comes. Such subdual can only be attained by the influence of divine love.

If the envious man, esteeming his own power to be lessened, inordinately desires another's destitution, again, not for the glory of GOD, not for the good of souls, not for the benefit of created things, but for the love of self—then, it follows, that the gift which conquers the sin of envy by the dictates of brotherly love, must be the conqueror also of selfishness from whence envy springs. Such conquest, again, can only be secured by the influence of divine love.

If the angry man, because of evil done to himself inordinately desires another's injury, once more, not for the glory of GOD, not for the good of souls, not for the benefit of created things, but for the love of self—then, it follows, that the gift which controuls the sin of anger by the discipline of meekness, must be the controuling power also of selfishness from whence anger flows. Such controul, once more, can only be obtained by the influence of divine love.

Hence, in the case of pride, envy and anger, sins which are vanquished respectively by humility, by brotherly love, and by meekness, it may be held that divine love is the antidote to the poison of human selfishness.

Neither is it otherwise in the case of the remaining deadly sins. Time fails us to examine this matter in detail, through the developments of selfishness which may be nullified by love that is perfect and divine, but which unchecked by love, take form in the sins of sloth, of covetousness, of gluttony, and of lust. Yet, thus much may be said, even in brief: The defaulter in love, he who once loved less than he might love the Highest Good, and strove after it all too slackly; but now, by loving, generous indulgence has become exact in his relations towards GOD and man, is one whose besetting selfishness has given way before the power of divine love. And the exceeder in love, he who once loved more than he ought to love the lower good of created things, whether in money, or in food, or in sensuality; but now in the spirit of self-sacrifice loves less immoderately such lower good, is one who, to this extent, has vanquished human selfishness by perfect love. He is liberally content with what GOD provides without the selfishness of covetousness. He employs temperately gifts which were given for use, and not

for neglect, and still less for abuse, apart from the selfishness of gluttony and excess. He chastely keeps guard over his sensual appetites, free from the bondage of selfishness in impurity. Divine love has purely purged away the dross of human selfishness. Self-sacrifice has been developed on the decay and death of self-love. Love has been perfected by love. In other words, in the case also of the last of the deadly sins, in the case of sloth, of covetousness, of gluttony, and of lust, as well as in the case of pride, envy and anger, the antidote to human selfishness may be affirmed to be the divine principle of love.

IV.

The last of the four elementary truths, in the relation between love and self and the capital sins, has thus been reached. In our first lecture, and with regard to man's accountability or man's perfection, we have seen,

I. That love is the principle of his action : and

II. That self is the origin of his sin.

We have learnt to-day, in the present lecture, and in relation to the battle of the Christian life, and the ultimate victory of love,

III. That sin is the development of his selfishness : and

IV. That the antidote to his selfishness is love.

We have now, therefore, considered the preliminary questions which I desired, by GOD'S help, to place before you, the answers to which tend to resolve our theory about sin, that as self is the source of sin, so divine love is the cure for self-love. And this leaves us free to consider the fourth of the capital sins, the single sin of love defective, the sin of sloth, of which I hope, please GOD, to speak in our next lecture.

A. M. D. G.

LECTURE SIX.

OF THE DEADLY SIN OF SLOTH:

THE SIN OF LOVE DEFECTIVE.

"*And we desire that every one of you do shew the same diligence . . . that ye be not slothful, but followers of them who . . . inherit the promises.*" HEBREWS vi. 11, 12.

I.

IN the threefold division of imperfect or human love, the development of which leads to deadly sin, we have seen, on a former occasion, that the capital sin of Sloth occupies a middle position between two different classes of sin. It is to this result of imperfect love—sloth—that I have to direct your attention today; sloth, the sin of the defaulter in love, the sin which, in our sad scheme of wickedness, stands midway between the sins of the distorter of love which we have

considered, and the sins of the exceeder in love which we shall hereafter consider.

In attempting to ascertain the relations between love and self and sin, and to elaborate a theory on their interdependence and mutual connection, upon so wide a scale as is offered by the seven capital sins, it is as well, from time to time, to recall to mind our landmarks. Having concluded our inquiry into one class of sins, and before we enter on the discussion of another class of sins, the present seems a fit time to take once more a rapid survey of our position. And such a survey will best be made in relation to the sin which forms an order by itself, and naturally divides from each other the other two classes—the sin of sloth. You may remember, then, that the distorter of love, he who loves ill or evil to those whom he should love as himself, namely, his neighbour, sins by pride, by envy, and by anger. The exceeder in love, he who loves more than he ought to love some lower created good, sins by covetousness, by gluttony, or by lust. But the defaulter in love, he who loves less than he might love the Highest Good, that is GOD, is guilty of the deadly sin of sloth. And the sin of sloth bears the following human relations to the four elementary truths which have been already considered. Thus:

1. Love being the motive principle of all human

action, as we saw in our first lecture, sloth falls short of perfection through a deficiency of love. It loves GOD, if we may personate the sin, it loves GOD too little. 2. Self being the source and origin of sin, in regard to human sin, slothfulness becomes sinful through an excess of self-love. For, if a man loves the Creator too little, it follows as a matter of course, that he loves the creature too much: and under any form of created things, such love must centre in self. Again: 3. It was shown in our last lecture that the deadly sins, being developments of selfishness, through imperfect love, the slothful man strives all too slackly after the love of GOD, and seeks not at all to perform those duties which are the outgrowth of such love. And lastly: 4. Love being the antidote to the poison of self, the remedy for the sin of sloth consists in loving GOD more thoroughly and more nearly as He ought to be loved; for perfect love is the fulfilling of the law.

II.

First of all, we will endeavour to obtain, at the outset of the lecture, from these considerations a definition of the deadly sin which we have to consider. Sloth is the sin which selfishly feels inordinate indisposition of soul towards the love of GOD. It takes the form of incon-

tinent indolence, which makes us wish to neglect our duty, rather than to perform it. And it may be described in a single word. For whilst the six other deadly sins are sins of commission, sloth is the one capital sin of omission.

Sloth, then, may be defined as the sin of omission. It stands equidistant from the sins which are more or less spiritual in character, and from those which are more or less sensual. As a development of selfishness, it forms an exception to the other developments of imperfect love. It is neither wholly sensual, nor wholly spiritual; but in part affects, and in part is affected by both classes of sin. It occupies, as before said, a division by itself: and the fact that it stands alone, unmatched in kind or degree with any other sin, less influenced by than influencing all others, makes the task of analysing and discussing this sin one of exceeding difficulty. The difficulty is felt in at least two different ways. It is ever more easy to attack a definite disease, than one which is deficient in symptoms. It is easier to correct a positive fault, than to supply an absent and uncertain virtue. And sloth, eminently, is a sin of deficiency, is a negative form of sin. It loves too little: it leaves undone. The truth that the capital sins are states and conditions rather than overt acts of wickedness—that they are instincts rather

than instances—is specially true in the case of sloth. The remedy, then, for a condition of sinfulness, can only be said to be a condition of holiness of life which represents the opposite. We cannot counteract habitual sin, by single acts of duty, so long as the mental character remains unchanged. We cannot cure organic disease by mere local applications.

This vagueness of treatment is more than to other deadly sins applicable to the great sin of omission. In such a case it is hopeless to pass beyond the most indefinite generalities; it is almost impossible to give utterance to other than obvious truisms. For instance: If sloth is an indisposition of soul towards the love of GOD; it can only be affirmed that the cure for sloth is to be found in cultivating the love of GOD more entirely. If sloth assumes the shape of indolence towards our duty; we must seek to conquer sloth by persevering diligence in work. If it be the selfish sin of omission; we must counteract the poison by the antidote of self-sacrifice, by love in acts of commission. Indeed, the sin of sloth is so indefinite, and the manner in which it may be dealt with is so general, that it has a fair chance of escaping, and often practically escapes, correction, from the difficulty of dealing with the vice directly and in detail.

Yet, its vagueness is not the only difficulty which we

have to surmount in dealing with the sin of sloth. There is the further difficulty of its comprehensiveness. Its influence is absolutely boundless in the domain of Christian duty. It affects every deadly sin to be conquered. It influences each principal virtue to be acquired. There is no sin, the subdual of which may not be hindered by sloth. There is no virtue which may not be forfeited, from failing to seek it with sufficient diligence. Indeed, sloth bears the same relation to wickedness, that perseverance bears to holiness of life—only in an opposite direction. Distortion of love, on the one hand, and excess of love, on the other, will never be brought into harmony with divine love, by deficiency of love in the slothful man. The virtues of humility, brotherly love and meekness, the opposites respectively of the first three deadly sins, cannot be cultivated by one who deliberately loves GOD less than he might love the Highest Good. The vices of covetousness, gluttony and lust, viewed as results of the last three deadly sins, cannot be conquered in the mind or body of one who strives all too slackly for the conquest over excess of love, for the lower good of created things. And the comprehensiveness of sloth, in regard to the other capital sins, offers further difficulty in the way of its treatment.

For, if the deadly sin is the embodiment of more

than a constitutional disinclination for activity or exertion, in temporal or spiritual matters; it becomes needful to enquire, what are the symptoms in the general complaint which makes the disease specific? What are the features which take the results from the domains of negation, into the more easily recognised status of positive sin? When we speak of a slothful man, do we mean one whose sloth is evidenced in mental feeling by distorted love towards his neighbour; or in bodily action, by excessive love towards created things? Or is his sloth confined to influence on the mainspring of life, and exhibited in deficiency of love towards GOD? Our treatment of the sin of sloth, and our estimate of the victim of the sin, will depend, to a considerable extent, upon the answer which may be given to these questions.

Ancient spiritual writers, however, help us to surmount the difficulties, both as to the ambiguity, and also as to the universality of the sin of sloth. They draw, as it were, a genealogical table of the sins which own sloth for their unlovely and unloved ancestor; and show from the results which flow from the fountain-head on many sides, how indisposition of the soul towards GOD may develope, under the influence of inordinate selfishness; and in various ways, to the neglect and abandonment of our duty towards GOD,

towards our neighbour, towards created things, and towards ourself.

III.

The chief sins which issue from the stem of the tree of sloth are five in number. We will consider them in order, and more or less at length.

I. The first of the daughters of sloth is indifference towards holy things, and what has been termed numbness of soul with regard to one or more of the divine commands. This the earliest, even if the least sinful, is by no means the least dangerful of the results of sloth. Indifference, or numbness of soul may be compared to the effect of intense cold upon the extremities of the human body. The victim of the attack either fails to feel, or fails to notice, the sensation. He continues his work or his labour unaware of danger and unsuspecting of incapacity. But, having occasion to call upon the part affected to take more than a general share in the economy of the body corporate, the heedless sufferer is made painfully conscious of his loss of power; and the hand or the foot is found to be frost-bitten.

It is not otherwise with the spiritually chilled. They perform the duties of their religion much as usual,

neither better nor worse. They apparently neglect none of the more obvious claims of the supernatural life, and perhaps perform many that are not superficial. But, should any accident take them out of their usual course of action, should they be suddenly called upon to make some decided act of self-sacrifice towards their neighbour, or to give evidence of absorbing love towards GOD, they find themselves utterly powerless to answer to the supernatural call. They were unconscious of having lost power with GOD; they were unconscious of having lost sympathy for man; they were unconscious —until the virtue was gone, absolutely gone. It is not unlikely, in either case, mental or physical, that lookers-on were more aware, than the person chiefly concerned, of the coming attack; and perhaps a neighbourly warning, or a friendly shake might have saved the member of either the spiritual or sensuous frame from impotency. But, as it is, force to the body or force to the soul, for the moment, has been sacrificed, and their permanent vigour has been endangered. In both cases careful treatment, medical or priestly, is needed, to ensure restoration to comparative health.

II. Indifference, then, or numbness of soul about the things of GOD, is the first-born of sloth; but she quickly gives place, by what may be called the prin-

ciple of spiritual selection, to a more favoured sister in the struggle for existence. Nature, we are told, abhors a vacuum; and whatever amount of truth may be contained in this saying, it is a matter of experience, that two bodies cannot occupy the same position in space at the same time, whether such bodies be material or spiritual. There can be no doubt that grace is utterly impatient of indifference; and where this effect of sloth possesses the soul, the love of GOD, under a higher law than even the expression of His will in Nature, has ceased to abide. To prevent, therefore, the continuance of a spiritual vacuum which is empty, swept and garnished by indifference, many evil spirits more wicked than itself, and with more favourable conditions for obtaining the mastery, enter in and dwell there. And the second occupant which fulfils the soul of the slothful is dissipation of mind in favour of created things, a tenant which is worse than the first.

Now dissipation of mind in favour of the creature must take one of two forms. It will love created things, either more than is due, or less than is meet. It may be assumed, that love expended on that which falls short of the Highest Good, will be in excess rather than in deficiency: and there is every reason to suppose, that the man who loves more than he ought to

love some lower good, will become guilty of covetousness, or of gluttony, or of lust. For, the love of the creature, though it admits of almost an endless number of variations in detail, may, in the development of inordinate selfishness, be classed under one of these three divisions of excess in love.

Examine this point more closely. The slothful man, in the first place, almost instinctively desires possessions, money, or money's worth, under temptation to covetousness, which sloth will not allow him to seek after diligently. Such feeling, under the circumstances, is found to be well-nigh irresistible: and we know that money is the root of all evil. The slothful man, next, is indisposed to deny himself in meat and drink; and his mind seems forced to dwell upon cognate temptations, whom sloth prevents from accepting the Apostolic injunction, that he who will not work, neither shall he eat. Lastly, the slothful man is fairly certain to fall into the debasing sin of impurity. For, he who loves more than he ought to love some lower good, inevitably gravitates to the lowest possible point, beyond which he can be attracted no further. And such centre of gravity, in many fallen natures, is to be found only in deadly sins of the flesh: for, there is a development of slothful selfishness,[2] which the Apostle places in intimate connection with wantonness against CHRIST.

When, however, dissipation in favour of the creature reaches this point, when the slothful, as the defaulter in divine love, loves more than he ought to love, money, or food, or sensual gratification, then, the sin of sloth has become developed into the sin of covetousness, of gluttony, or of lust; and under the headship of one of these deadly sins against our own souls, we must look, respectively, for its further consideration.

III. To indifference and dissipation of mind may be added, as a third offspring of sloth, a sin which I shall call, 'aversion from sanctity.' And this antipathy to religion in the abstract, and to Him Whom religion personates; this antipathy to religion when it takes form in outward expression and influences men and women with whom we are brought into contact; this antipathy exhibits itself in two ways. The slothful man may be offended at holy things; he may even come to hate them. The slothful man feels offended at holy persons; and also eventually hates them. It is, perhaps, not unnatural that the selfish slothful should first be offended at and then hate those acts of religion which, directly or indirectly, would check his selfishness or stimulate his sloth. It is not unnatural that he should feel the same sentiments towards those whose office it is to attempt to make him holy by holy means;

or towards those, perhaps, who themselves seek to become the one through the other. But it is not, at first sight, transparently clear, why aversion from sanctity in any given human being should find expression in offence or hatred, towards holy persons with whom he is *not* brought into contact, and towards holy things by which he is *not* directly influenced. And yet, experience shows, that, apart from all individual connection with either, such aversion from sanctity fills the soul of the selfish man who is slothful, fulfils it even to the verge of possession.

How does this aversion from sanctity, which may verge in some cases towards demoniacal possession, manifest itself? It takes form in many ways; and of course, the feeling intensifies as it becomes developed. The slothful man first of all neglects the means of grace, both ordinary and sacramental. He discovers, so he conceives, that daily prayer is consumptive of time which might be better employed. He persuades himself that early Communion is a strain upon his powers, which incapacitates him for his daily work. Sunday (he holds) is too completely a day of rest, bodily and mentally—and both elements of our nature are taxed by divine worship—to be devoted to serving GOD. Overmuch prayer is weariness to the flesh, and its advantage if not doubtful, is certainly not distinct.

Confession of sin (he argues) is not so essential to a Christian man as abstaining from sin: it even destroys independence and virility of character. Self-examination is suitable for women, or effeminate men; and meditation is needful for religious. And books, the tendency of which is not bad, are preferable for reading to those of a devotional character, whose aim is direct and clear. Such, my Brethren, are specimens of the sophistries with which the slothful man justifies to himself his selfishness. Such are some of the truths which are truisms, which are half-truths, which are perverted truths, which in matter, if not in form, are falsehoods, with which the selfish man deceives his own soul.

But, the defaulter in love, who strives all too slackly after the means of grace, by which he may attain to the Highest Good, seldom remains content with mere neglect of such means. The neglect which began, perhaps, with a certain tenderness of conscience, increases as conscience hardens by repeated negligence, and eventually becomes habitual. The slothful passes through the stages of indifference and dissipation, which develope, by no uncertain or unmarked course, into positive dislike, hatred, and even loathing. Indeed, such development possesses almost the certainty of law. But, without speculating, in this place, upon the causes

of the swift declension from piety to godlessness, it may suffice to point out a few examples of aversion from sanctity, as a system of revealed dogma, of ecclesiastical discipline, of Church authority in ceremonial, or as an expression of Catholic custom or opinion; examples, which are at once suggestive of and evidence for the law.

1. Take the case of the most holy Eucharist, as a cardinal instance of this truth. Slothful men begin a career which ends in aversion from sanctity, in matters of doctrine, by neglecting this ordinance of CHRIST. They neglect to make meet preparation to receive into the chamber of the soul their Maker and their GOD—by self-examination and confession of sin. They neglect to receive their LORD and Master under due bodily conditions, with physical dispositions the highest and holiest they can offer—before earthly food passes their lips. They neglect to make thanksgiving, I do not say worthy of the gift bestowed upon them, for that were impossible; but giving of thanks at all, to Him Whom they have received, after they have received Him. They neglect to worship Him without reception either on week-days or Sundays, when they may enjoy so great privilege with so little exercise of self-denial. Thus they begin. And neglect of the practice enjoined

by the Church, leads on to and ends in denial of the doctrine which she teaches. Indifference to the act of Communion developes indifference to the position of the sacrament in the divine scheme of revelation. They ignore the mystery of which it is both mainspring and centre. They explain away the doctrine of the Eucharist, and deny that it claims to be a sacrifice before it can be a sacrament. They decline to see the universality of the duty of fasting Communion; and failing to perceive, they will not bow to the world-wide condemnation of after-breakfast or after-dinner Communions—for there is no difference in principle between the two kinds of non-fasting reception. They will not own that the Blessed Eucharist is the one and only public service instituted by our Divine Master, and hence that the holy Oblation ought to be offered in every church, as in this church, daily. And they eventually come to abhor both the doctrine upheld and the upholders of it. They malign the dogma and persecute those who teach it. And failing to obey the LORD'S command, they come to disbelieve its reality; and their aversion from the truth makes them join with the sceptical followers of CHRIST, who profanely said: "How can this MAN give us His Flesh to eat?"

2. The same law of declension, also, is evident, if we

turn from dogma to discipline. The man who loves less than he might love the Highest Good, and fails to conquer his besetting sin of sloth, not only is apathetic towards but neglects the sacrament of confession. Here, at once are two stages in the downward course towards aversion. But the apathetic man seldom stays long, or stays at all, at neglecting confession. That which he neglects, by the action of religious Nemesis, he comes to dislike. He dislikes the sacrament, dislikes those who administer its benefits, dislikes those who submit to its discipline. Nor does his antipathy cease with dislike. The slothfully selfish eventually blasphemes confession, maligns confessors, and despises penitents. He not only will not himself approach the tribunal of mercy, but prevents those whom he may influence from obtaining its blessings, and slanders those who dispense them. In short, from loving less than he might love, he eventually ceases to love at all. Love is turned into hate. From neglecting and defaming one of the sacraments of the Church, the selfish man becomes averse from sanctity both in itself and in its professors. And he is ultimately given over to believe a lie, a lie which takes shape in a half-truth which is wholly false, and contents itself with repeating parrot-like the question of the faithless Jews of old: "Who can forgive sins but GOD alone?"

3. The same law of debasement, once more, is evident, if we turn from Christian dogma and discipline to Christian ritual. Those who will not submit to Catholic practice, and speak lightly of Catholic discipline, are little likely to sanction Catholic ceremonial which expresses the one and accompanies the other. Here I take the case of the avowed religious libertine: for the case of the mere dilettante High Churchman so-called, who professes to love high ritual in conjunction with low belief and lax practice, I decline to entertain—he is an anomaly in the kingdom of grace, and need be referred to here no further. Indifference, then, to ceremonial, in the highest act of Christian worship in which we can join, is another form of aversion from sanctity, caused by the sin of sloth. For instance: Take any outward act which is patent and evident to all, instantaneously, such as the eastward position of the priest when celebrating, or an act of humble reverence at the "Incarnatus Est" in the Creed; or take any unobvious, and not always observable, but highly significant ceremony, such as offering the mixed chalice, or the lavabo after the offertory: and how does the selfish man estimate the matter, and desire to act upon it? His indifference first of all, observe, my Brethren, makes him tolerate and patient of departures from Catholic usage; and

then, on the other hand, makes him intolerant and impatient of any restoration in doing the things of GOD decently and in order. He not only finds no edification to his own soul in the ceremonial of the Church; but would selfishly deprive those who are edified by those harmless aids to devotion (to take the lowest view) which bear the consent of Christendom. Neither does his selfish sloth end in desire or thought. He allows himself to descend from evil wishes to evil words and actions. He speaks ill of that which he dislikes, he speaks ill of those who use what he dislikes, until he hates both it and them: and his aversion from sanctity causes him to employ every effort to abolish from the modern Church of to-day the orderly, the intelligent, and I will add, the lawful ceremonial of Catholic antiquity.

4. Hatred of holy things and holy persons is not confined, however, to the legitimate object of the one, or to the active work of the other. Aversion from sanctity finds scope for display in other ways. Of these, I shall take two for further notice, different in character, different in manner of exhibition, and different also in the class whence they spring; one only in their immoral origin and source. The first gives evidence of popular prejudice, and is confined

to a comparatively innocent exhibition of aversion from sanctity. The other expresses intellectual hatred of the keenest sort, and is not confined to evidence which is innocent.

For instance: The oldest amongst us may easily recall the time when our brethren of the Roman Catholic clergy could not appear in public, in priestly garb, without causing a certain amount of popular excitement amongst passers-by. Many of us can remember that a similar sensation was created by our own Sisters of Mercy, in the earlier days of the Catholic Revival, when they ventured abroad in their conventual habit. And even now, at the present day, an English priest or religious, in his cassock and cloak, is no unobserved, is no uncommented phenomenon, in the streets of London. It is not difficult, of course, to account for such small indications of popular feeling, by simple curiosity. But there is, I believe, a deeper cause below. The insignificant disturbance on the surface of society, at the sight of that which personates a belief in something higher and holier than the world can understand, arises from the impatience of the world towards religion and its professors, is caused at least by either conscious or unconscious aversion from sanctity.

Nor is it otherwise, again, with the infidel opinion

of the day, as represented by the public press. Newspapers which appeal to educated readers, we will say, of the upper orders, and which are acute, far-seeing, just, wise, temperate, when speaking of things of this world, in politics and law, in letters, science, or art, become the opposite of all these qualities when matters of the next world are discussed. The word 'priest,' save coupled with a sneer; belief in the supernatural, except it be denied; the theory of the sacraments, if accepted, or the necessity of creeds, if believed; the hope of heaven, from a Christian point of view, and the fear of hell, under any circumstances—any of these thoughts, received on authority only, are enough to throw off their balance presumable leaders of public opinion. In their anxiety to proclaim themselves infidel, and in their eagerness to attack the truth, with the infallibility of journalism, they lose self-controul. A spirit seems to possess them, at which I glanced above, of Satanic hatred of the faith: not, observe, my Brethren, not of this or that form of belief, but of the faith itself, under any form of divine revelation. And this possession not only cramps their soul, but—little as they think it—dwarfs their intellect; so that such writers appear incapable to sustain an argument, or to master a theological proposition, which yet they purpose to demolish or explain away. And the

calm ignorance which men otherwise learned display; and the positive nonsense which men otherwise rational publish, when they venture to criticise our holy Religion, is suggestive of only one explanation—namely, that these writers, being apostates from the faith, have been given over to judicial blindness, as a punishment, even in this life, for their deliberate and studied aversion from sanctity.

IV. The fourth of the developments of the sin of sloth, 1. to numbness of soul, 2. to indifference, and 3. to aversion from sanctity, is to be found in cowardice, or fearing and avoiding pain or labour in the service of GOD. This result of sloth flows almost directly from our definition of one possessed by this deadly sin. For, the defaulter in love, who loves less than he might love the Highest Good, and strives after it all too slackly, would naturally be indisposed towards any sacrifice for GOD. Such a man accepts all that GOD sends him, if not as his due, at least without much question as to his personal fitness for divine benefactions. Neither may he in any way misuse, wrongly enjoy, or over-tax GOD'S gifts. He may stand, perhaps, between either extreme. He may not be so bad as the worst type of slothfulness, as the man who hid his lord's talent in the earth. Nor yet, may he be able to boast that

his pound has diligently gained ten pounds. He is rather in the position of the servant who had received two talents and had just managed to gain also two other talents besides them. And here we take a favourable, not to say prejudiced, view of the selfish slothful. We allow him to be credited with the benefit of the doubt, that he may possibly appear in the middle position between the very bad and the very good. This place is assigned him not without sufficient reason. For, as a matter of fact, it is the position towards sloth which the vast majority of persons—respectable members of society—actually and almost deliberately assume. It would be uncharitable to say that they make no use of their talent. They do not. It would be untrue to affirm that they made of it the best possible use. They have not. They do or have done neither the one nor the other. They stand in that almost hopeless and altogether unsatisfactory of all positions, in a dull, common-place, self-satisfied, mediocrity. Almost hopeless, I say, because they present few openings for the attack of the prophet of GOD, who would convince them of sin; and altogether unsatisfying, because they possess insufficient stamina for the making of a genuine saint.

Such as these, my Brethren, such as these are incapable of self-sacrifice. They know not the senti-

ment of generosity of conduct towards GOD. There is no enthusiasm in their nature; and no power of voluntary mortification. And yet, enthusiasm is but a cold word to express the love which we ought to bear towards our Divine Master, of Whom the honey-tongued Father could write,

> JESU, the very thought of Thee
> With sweetness fills the breast:

whilst the same Divine LORD has distinctly told us, as if to indicate the minimum of mortification as the measure of our supernatural life, that except a man take up—voluntarily take up—his cross daily and follow Him, he cannot be a disciple of the Crucified.

On this large subject, I shall say but few words, and will only take an average member of society, as a single example of one who little esteems himself guilty, even in a modified manner, of the sin of sloth. Such an one may be married or single. He may live by himself or with some near relative. He is engaged in trade, manufacture, education, or government work. He is punctual at his office or business in the morning, and exact in the time of leaving his appointed labour in the evening. Meanwhile, he is scrupulous in performing his duty, and gives back full measure for all that he receives. Nor is he forgetful of his Maker. Though GOD is not in all his thoughts, yet he is

regular in his private devotions, and is a church-goer at certain times and seasons—to what extent in either case I pause not to inquire, for I assume it to be the extent to which conscience demands. He is, moreover, courteous to all with whom he is concerned officially; is kind and cheerful to those at home; takes every opportunity for self-culture; honestly enjoys and does not abuse his liberty; and does not wilfully turn his back upon any case of distress which comes directly before him.

Yet, at night, when he reviews the life in miniature which, in this exacting age, is compressed by the force of circumstances into the compass of a single day—if such an one should ask himself: "What good thing have I done to-day, over and above the limits of my duty?" what answer, think you, Brother or Sister in CHRIST, would he be able to make to his soul? And these questions: How have I shown my love to GOD? How have I benefited GOD'S image, for His sake? How have I used His creature, for GOD'S greater glory? How have I laid up in store for my own soul, GOD'S redeemed possession, against that great day; if not gold, silver, precious stone, at least hay, wood, stubble?—these questions may usefully be asked by many who do not account themselves average members only of the mystical body in the spiritual life. If we

love the Highest Good less than we might love, if we strive after it all too slackly, if we are a defaulter in love, we shall find much difficulty in making answer to such questions. And this difficulty ensues from a form of the fourth development of selfishness in sloth which we call cowardice, that is fearing or avoiding pain and labour in the service of our GOD.

V. The last development of sloth is the sin of despair. And, as it is the last, so is it also the most fearful. On this awful subject, I will only remind you, that the one only soul which holy Church has pronounced to be irrevocably lost, to be lost for ever, is the soul of him who gave way to the sin of despair; and that was the soul of the traitor, Judas: remind you only, I say, before repeating to you a story of despair with which I lately met, and which will illustrate the danger of this form of sloth more effectually than any words of my own. I shall relate it almost in the simple language of the original.

An aged man, who had lived without GOD in the world, and who against light and knowledge had been guilty of many sins, was at the point of death, when a priest, to whom the soul of the sinner was dear, visited him, and urged him, even at the last hour, to seek that repentance which he had so long and so slothfully

delayed. The sick man, the victim of slothful despair, either would return no answer to the priest's entreaties to make confession of his sins; or returned answer only to postpone the needful act of penitence. At last, after many solicitations for the love of JESUS, the old man was persuaded to confession. "To-morrow," said he, "I will confess my sins." To-morrow came. The patient was worse—a day nearer to both death and judgment—a day nearer either to Heaven or to Hell. But the priest was prepared to execute his holy office. He spoke kindly to the sick man, encouraged him, prayed with him, made the sign of the Cross, and awaited his confession. But the sick man uttered nothing. The priest again encouraged him to begin; when the victim of despair suddenly recited, in a sepulchral tone, the psalmist's description of the sinner: "The ungodly shall see it, and it shall grieve him:" and immediately hid his face beneath the bed-clothes. The confessor uncovered the old man's head, told him that there was no time to be lost, and urged him again and again to make his confession at once. "Yes, Father, I will confess," said he: and repeating, but with weaker voice, the second part of the text, continued: "He shall gnash with his teeth and consume away;" and again, immediately hid his face in the bed-clothes. Again, the man of GOD gently uncovered

his head; and to entreaties, for his soul's sake to make confession at once, he added the tears of burning charity. "Yes, Father; yes, Father," said the dying man once more; "I will confess:" and once more hid his face in the bed-clothes, after having gasped out with difficulty, word by word, the last portion of the concluding verse of the 112th Psalm: "The desire of the ungodly shall perish." The priest once again gently uncovered the old man's head; but the slothful, selfish sinner who despaired of GOD'S mercy was dead. He had passed away to his last account.

IV.

Thus have we glanced at the five principal sins which branch from the root of sloth:

1. Indifference or numbness of soul towards religion.
2. Dissipation of mind from the Creator to the creature.
3. Aversion from sanctity, from holy things and holy persons, even from sights and sounds which bring to mind the supernatural.
4. Cowardice in the service of GOD.
5. The last and indelible sin of Judas, the sin of despair.

These are the five developments, which take from

the ambiguity of the sin of sloth, and make it definite; which grasp the universality of the sin of sloth, and make it particular. These are the developments which mark this form of evil as the deadly sin of omission. As in former cases, I have attempted to place before you a general survey of the sin in question, a statement of its position in the constitution of wickedness, and an analysis of some of its main features, more or less complete. With such an attempt, imperfect as it is in plan, and still more imperfect as it is in execution, I am forced to be content. All application of the details of the sin to your own individual cases I must leave, of necessity, to yourselves, to your souls, to your director, and to your GOD.

In conclusion, I will only say thus much: That sloth being that developed form of inordinate selfishness which, striving after the love of GOD all too slackly, loves less than it might love the Highest Good; sloth can only be conquered by the performance of those acts of commission which are the opposites of the five sins of omission that constitute sloth. In other words, the distorter of love must conquer sloth,

First, by zeal for religion, which is the opposite of indifference;

Secondly, by self-collectedness and concentration of soul upon GOD, which is the opposite of dissipation;

Thirdly, by love for, and attraction towards holy things, which is the opposite of aversion from sanctity;

Fourthly, by boldness in the service of CHRIST, which is the opposite of cowardice;

And lastly, by perfect confidence in the mercy of GOD towards penitent souls to the end, which is the opposite of the awful sin of despair.

A. M. D. G.

A THEORY ABOUT SIN.

PART III.

SINS OF LOVE EXCESSIVE.

PART III.

SINS OF LOVE EXCESSIVE.

LECTURE SEVEN.

SOME SECONDARY QUESTIONS IN THE RELATION BETWEEN LOVE AND SELF AND SIN.

LECTURES EIGHT, NINE, AND TEN.

OF THE DEADLY SINS OF AVARICE, GLUTTONY, AND LUST.

LECTURE ELEVEN.

FINAL QUESTIONS IN THE RELATION BETWEEN LOVE AND SELF AND SIN.

LECTURE SEVEN.

SOME SECONDARY QUESTIONS IN THE RELATION BETWEEN LOVE AND SELF AND SIN.

I. OF THE INTERDEPENDENCE BETWEEN THE DEADLY SINS: II. OF THE IMPERFECTION OF THEIR NUMBER.

"And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a Beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns . . . and upon his heads the name of Blasphemy."

REVELATION XIII. 1.

I.

IN the examination of so wide a field of theological and moral inquiry as that of the Seven Capital Sins, and the relation between love and self and sin, some primary questions must of necessity be overlooked, and many secondary questions can only be treated with superficial brevity. It would have been impossible to consider certain questions, even in general terms. It would have proved harmful to the argument attempted above, and distracting to sustained thought, had certain other questions been so much as named. Yet it tends towards the complete-

ness of our estimate of the seven enemies of the soul that an effort should be made to delineate features which have been hitherto untraced. Indeed, a theory about sin would be obviously imperfect which failed in an attempt, however feeble, to deal with such elements. Hence, it may be an advantage to be enabled to consider some of these omitted points, whether subordinate or essential, with a view to lessen the imperfection which cannot entirely be removed.

It is hardly needful to tabulate these hitherto neglected elements of inquiry. The larger part of the omissions must have been made mentally conscious to all in the course of the foregoing discussion. The dogmatic or practical hiatus caused by the absence of other component parts may, perhaps, have been overlooked in the progress of the argument. But whether or not such defects were observed at the time, the benefit, if not the necessity, of a more detailed treatment of the matters in question will become apparent when such deficiencies are, in part, supplied. To the consideration of two of these points, therefore, without further preface, we will now address ourselves.

II.

There is one question of some interest intellectually, and not without importance devotionally, connected

with the deadly sins, to which I invite your attention in the first instance. If there is any truth in the theory maintained in the lectures introductory to the two former parts, if our premisses are sound and our argument is without fault, there is more interdependence and relationship between the guilty seven than at first sight seems probable. Let us consider this point—the interdependence of the seven capital sins—in detail. First, let us see what may be urged against this position by observing the elements of discord which exist between the deadly sins. From discord we will turn to harmony; and we will examine those features, secondly, which the deadly sins possess in common. Lastly, we will endeavour to find an average between these opposite elements.

First: The differences which separate the deadly or capital sins from one another are obvious. They are the result in the soul of man of the three forms of imperfect love—of love in obliquity, of love in deficiency, and of love in excess. The effects obtainable from such varied sources, from sources in some cases opposite and in others antagonistic, must needs be various. This is the first note of discord between the sevenfold development of sin. Again: The deadly sins are divisible into three distinct classes.

In one of these classes the spiritual ingredients overpower the sensual: in one, the sensual components outweigh the spiritual: in one, the two elements are intimately connected with each other. Such clearly marked divisions must be the result of organic differences equally distinct, which ensue in results equally variable. This is the second note of discord. Again: These seven sins, if we may be allowed to personate them, may also be viewed under other mutable circumstances. They may be actively directed against man, as their chief antipathy: or they may fall short of, or be turned from GOD, as their last end: or they may be attracted towards created things, as their highest earthly satisfaction. And the opposite conclusions to which they severally tend, point to qualities equally opposite, by which they may be severally distinguished. This is the third and last note of discord which shall be named.

Such, Brethren, are some of the peculiarities which constitute the differences observable between the sevenfold development of evil which we are estimating.

Secondly: On the other hand, what are the circumstances attending the deadly sins which afford evidence of their relationship and mutual dependence? That such circumstances may be mentioned appears pro-

bable from considering the differences already stated: and their record will prove the harmonies which have been suggested. For instance: First, in the case of each of the sins, there exists but one motive principle energising the different emotions called into play, which is love. For love, as we have seen, is the principle of all human action; and the deadly sins are only human actions done under certain conditions of love, from certain motives of love, with certain results of love. And this causes one element of harmony between the deadly seven. Next: In each case the parentage of the capital sins, together with their training or culture, is but one. For human selfishness is the source and origin of human sin in general; and in particular the capital sins are only the expression of developed and inordinate selfishness consequent on various forms of imperfect or human love. This creates another element of dependence which produces harmony among the seven. Then, thirdly: In each case the remedy for the capital sins is also one —one only. For love, perfect and divine, is the antidote to the poison of self. And this produces yet another element of dependence, which results in harmony amidst the otherwise discordant agencies of ill.

Such, Brethren, again, are some of the features,

either in cause or effect, either in development or cure, which these seven sins possess in common.

How may we estimate the value of these diversities and affinities respectively, so as to be able either to compare or contrast them, or to obtain an average which may indicate either and satisfy both? The balance will not be difficult to discover; nor will it be hard to decide towards which end it inclines. The characteristics of the two opposite influences which bear upon the deadly sins are plainly marked. The differences which tend to separate them, are differences in degree rather than in kind. The similarities which tend to unite them, evidence agreement in principle rather than in detail. A common factor of the seven which influences the principle, which influences the origination, which influences the development, which influences the extinction of an habitual course of action, is not to be weighed against mere antagonistic results in form, or in class, or in any outward and variable circumstance. Hence we conclude, that the seven capital sins are severally related more nearly than they are independent. Further inquiry shows, that they are mutually related by close, intimate, and sometimes unexpected affinities.

This theoretical conclusion is strengthened by taking a practical though superficial view only of the capital

sins. For example: Consider the sins individually. Sloth, in order to become otherwise than vaguely general, finds an outlet, first negatively, in failing to combat pride, envy, or anger; and then, positively, in yielding to the attacks of covetousness, gluttony, or lust. And this feature in the nature or development of one sin, sloth, furnishes a plain note of interdependence between all the seven sins. Again: Pride and anger are intimately connected in their results. For, the proud man is almost certain to feel annoyed if his self-love be wounded: and the angry man would perhaps seldom be incensed if he were clothed with the virtue of humility. Here, then, we find obvious marks of connection between other two of the deadly sins; and these both the product of a single cause, distorted love. Take, again, other two of the same sinful family, in this case the product of different efforts of imperfect love, oblique and excessive—I mean the sins of envy and covetousness. These two sins, however opposite in their cause, are nearly akin in their effect; and indeed in certain phases they are absolutely identical. Or, once more, take the two remaining sins, which owe their origin to a single form of imperfect love, love in excess. Gluttony and lust are so far allied, that they are often mutually related as cause and consequence. For instance: Intemperance, as an in-

centive, frequently leads to impurity, in thought, word, or deed. Impurity indulged frequently leads to intemperance, in order to silence conscience, to support shame, to hide disgrace, to drown despair. From this cursory view, therefore, of the deadly sins, it appears, that whatever differences may be seen in detail, whatever variations may be found in degree, yet substantial agreement subsists in certain forms of action and reaction, between pride, envy and anger on the one side; between covetousness, gluttony and sloth on the other side; with sloth as the unholy mean between the two.

These instances afford but general evidence to a general proposition. Closer affinities will be observable upon more minute and detailed inspection of and comparison between the capital sins. Here, however, my Brethren, your patience and the time at my disposal interpose limits. There are seven deadly sins; and if we estimate the relationship which each individual sin bears to each other individual sin, an easy mathematical calculation will suggest to how great a length the examination may extend. I therefore purpose to confine our attention to two only of these enemies of our soul, to the first and last of the seven sins; and to endeavour to see by what principle pride, and to what extent impurity affect, or are affected by, the other deadly sins respectively.

First: Consider the case of pride, in regard to what may be termed first principles in deadly sin. Pride has been described as an inordinate belief in, desire of, or love for self-excellence, for this one object, the love of self. If this definition be accepted, we can easily trace the connection between the sin of pride and the other two sins which flow from love distorted, namely envy and anger. All three of them, if again we may personate the sins, love evil to their neighbour. Take them severally, and estimate them with care. The envious man inordinately desires another's destitution, because he esteems his own power to be lessened. But here come the crucial questions—Why should he esteem his own power to be lessened, if he be not a proud man? Why should he not welcome such lessening of power, if he possess a true estimate of himself as a humble man? Hence, we see at once that the sin of pride is clearly connected, under certain aspects, with the sin of envy. Again: The angry man inordinately desires another's injury, because of evil, real or imagined, done to himself. But here, again, come the crucial questions—Why should he think *that* to be evil absolutely, which relatively is less ill than he actually deserves? Why should he expect anything but ill or evil done to himself, if he were judged by GOD, or rewarded by

man, according to his works ? Such would be his sentiments, were he not proud instead of humble, were he clothed with humility in the place of pride. But the angry man is not humble. He is essentially—if not constitutionally or by habit, yet in the moment of passion or in the hour of revenge he is essentially—a proud man. And pride is thus connected with anger as it is connected with envy, equally though in a different way.

Neither, if we pass from sins of distorted love to sins caused by deficiency of love, shall we find that there is no relationship between pride and sloth. The very definition of sloth is suggestive of the relationship. For, if a man loves GOD less than he might love Him, and if he strives after the Highest Good all too slackly, there is every chance that he is influenced by an inordinate belief in and love for self. Belief in self gradually eliminates belief in GOD : and love for self is incompatible with earnestly striving after the love of GOD. In other words, the defaulter in love who sins by sloth is guilty also of the sin of pride.

We will next consider the sins which arise from excess of love in man towards the lower good of created things : sins which find their natural issue in covetousness, in gluttony, in lust. Nor does the influence which we have seen existing in the case of love

distorted and of love in default fail to exhibit itself here also, though in this case we need not enter into detail. For, the man who is covetously desirous of possessions with which GOD has not endowed him, can scarcely fail to think that he, equally with or more than others, is deserving of such possessions; which is only another method of saying that he is proud, and in self-estimation is conceited. The man who is gluttonously wishful for food of better quality, or drink in more abundance than he is accustomed to, or can afford, or may obtain, would certainly not fall into such sins if he estimated his own worth at the value with which GOD esteems him, by the virtue of humility. And, the man who is a slave of sensual gratification, if indeed he be not sunk beneath the level of conscientious scruples, thinks that he, of all men, is enabled without self-abasement to indulge in sensuality; that he, of all men, possesses sufficient power of self-controul to descend into the bottomless pit of impurity so far and no farther; that the self-excellence in which he believes enables him, of all men, to love a lower good in created things more than he ought, and yet to escape the charge of deadly sin. And what is this, again, but the proud man's line of argument, on behalf of his own love for and belief in self? Hence, once more, in the case of lust, of gluttony, of covetousness,

not less than in the case of sloth, envy, anger, the man who is guilty of these forms of imperfect love is guilty also of the sin of pride.

Turn, now, from principle to practice, and consider the sin of lust in connection with the other deadly sins. First of all, there can be no sort of doubt, however it may be explained, that the first and last of the capital sins, pride and impurity, are intimately, nay mysteriously, related. It is acknowledged, I believe, by all spiritual writers who treat the subject of the latter, and also by some who treat of the former sin. It has been admitted by confessors. It is felt by penitents. It may be observed by ourselves. As a matter of fact, about which there is no question, though there may be many theories, pride and impurity walk hand in hand. The proud man almost inevitably falls into the sin of lust, perhaps as a direct, certainly as a suitable, punishment from GOD, in His permissive Will. The impure man always is, or always becomes, more or less proud in obedience to a law in human economy of universal obligation. And if we pass from these mutually dependent propositions, and turn to those which are not so self-evidently reciprocal in Christian ethics, we shall find that the lustful man is fairly certain, sooner or later, to be betrayed into the

sins of envy and covetousness. Indeed, under one aspect, and under certain conditions of mental action, lust, envy, and covetousness are but three developments of a single sin. For, he who loves more than he ought to love the lower good of created things, under the influence of sensuality—to take a wide view of the case—cannot but love evil to those whom he should love as himself apart from sensuality. In other words, the exceeder in love becomes self-evolved into a distorter of love. Excess in one direction not unnaturally developes into obliquity in another direction; and the sensual man becomes envious. Neither can he remain there as his last development. The enviously impure becomes impurely covetous. For, should a limit be placed upon self-indulgence, the lustful man will witness or conceive sensual gratifications which others lawfully enjoy: seeing or knowing such gratifications, he will be tempted to desire them: and, inordinately desiring such gratifications, he will sin by coveting them. And thus the circle of moral iniquity becomes self-completed: the victim of impurity becomes the victim also of the sin of covetousness.

Nor is it otherwise in the case of the remaining deadly sins, anger, sloth, and gluttony. The connection between these developments respectively of

the three forms of imperfect love and the sin of impurity; how their influence bears upon it; how it may be generated from them; how these sins may originate from lust, is too obvious to need more than a passing observation. Anger generally follows in the wake of sensual gratification; for hate quickly, if not bitterly, succeeds to love in sensuality gratified. Sloth proverbially leads to impurity; and the lustful man naturally and almost inevitably sinks into indolence. And the love of created things over much in eating and drinking, or the absence of mortification in one division of our complex nature, leads, without exception, to self-indulgence in other divisions; and hence, in Scriptural language, the "gluttonous man and the wine-bibber" falls an easy prey to the attacks of the demon of impurity.

We may allow, then, I think, after a consideration even as superficial as the above inquiry into both classes of temptation, that in practice, not less than in principle, the deadly sin of lust both influences and is influenced by the sins of pride, envy and covetousness, of anger, sloth and gluttony.

III.

The remaining point which demands our attention is the asserted, and, from a certain point of view,

the actual, imperfection of the catalogue of the deadly sins.

Objections to the systematic order of the sins and their number, as the Church has arranged and limited them, meet us under two distinct forms, both in ethics and in sentiment. We will consider them one by one.

I. What may be called without disrespect the sentimental objection to an exhaustive division of the sevenfold enemies of our soul is perhaps the most common and, I will add, the least reasonable. Men say in a vague sort of manner, men say with the confidence which want of evidence often inspires, as if the question were unanswerable—Why should there be seven capital sins, neither more nor less? Why should there not be six or eight sins? Or, if you are anxious for a number which has, or is supposed to have, a more mystical sound or look, why not five or nine? It would seem, continues the objector, that the Church first decided on the number seven, and then proceeded to allot the like tale of sins to complete the list.

Now, of course, in reply to objections based not upon evidence, but on the supposed fitness of things as they present themselves to the objector's mind, the best rejoinder is at once the most direct and opposite.

To a Catholic, it would appear that the reason why the Church teaches there are a certain number of deadly sins, is simply this—because as a matter of experience she has found the actual number to be seven, neither less nor more. And to a Churchman, the questions come as naturally as the reverse may sound in the ears of a non-Churchman—Why should there *not* be seven capital sins? Why should there be either nine or five? Is there anything in the fitness of things either against the negative, or in favour of the affirmative position? And when we consider that the Church teaches us to hold seven to be the number of the capital sins, this answer to a faithful member of CHRIST'S Body is sufficient. It rests with those beyond her blessed influence to show, upon evidence stronger than sentiment, that there should be, or that there is, a number to represent the capital sins other than the number, at once both mystical and matter of fact, seven.

But I am not disposed to take refuge in a mere juggle of words, or balancing of question and answer. Apart from the direct teaching of the Church; apart from all evidence to the contrary; apart from direct evidence in their favour, which we shall consider by and by—there is much indirectly to suggest to a devout mind that there are neither less nor more

than seven deadly enemies of our soul. Indirect evidence, in such a matter, may be taken to be evidence sufficiently strong to oppose to mere sentimental objections on the other side. And such evidence may be furnished from a Catholic interpretation of a large number of passages in Holy Scripture, of which I shall here quote but a few.

For instance: There were certain nations in Canaan which the children of Israel were commanded to conquer before they could inherit the Promised Land; and holy men have ever understood these nations to represent in a figure our sins, which we must vanquish before we can reach the Heavenly Jerusalem. These nations, equally with the capital sins, were seven in number. Again: In the daily sacrifice for sin, under the Jewish Law, the priest was directed both for his own sins and for the sins of the people, to sprinkle the blood of bullocks before the LORD; and the number of times which the priest was ordered to sprinkle such sacrificial blood was the same with the number of our root sins—seven. Again: Naaman, the Syrian, was ordered by the prophet Elisha to wash in the waters of Jordan to recover him of his leprosy, the world-wide type of sin. Can we doubt that he washed once for each of the typical sins of man's fallen nature—seven times? Solomon tells us

that the just man falleth into sin: for who is he that liveth and sinneth not? And when we learn that he falleth seven times, can we doubt that there exists for us, Catholics, a mystical allusion to the seven deadly sins of man's regenerated nature?

Nor, if we turn from the Old Testament Scriptures to those of the New, shall we fail to find that the same number, seven, appears over and over again in regard to sinners, in regard to sin. When our Divine Master was pleased to deliver from the power of sin her that was possessed by Satan, it is said that He cast out neither fewer nor more, but seven evil spirits from the saint of the future—one, surely, as typical of, if not as personating, each of the seven deadly sins. We are told, if our brother trespass against us daily, that we are to forgive him, on his penitence, daily—even to the extent of a sevenfold forgiveness. Is it fanciful to imagine that each fall and each forgiveness may typify, in cause or in effect, one of the seven capital or root sins? And lastly, we read in the Revelation of S. John the Divine of the spirits of GOD, whether or not their work may be to combat the sevenfold development of evil, that their number also is the mystical number, seven. Neither is it without significancy, apart from begging the question at issue, that there are seven Christian virtues, distinct from those

termed Theological and Cardinal, which have ever been esteemed the opposites of the seven capital sins.

From these indirect considerations it is not unlikely, to say the least, that the Church's estimate and limit of deadly sin is substantially correct—that there are seven distinct and definite enemies of our inner life, neither less nor more. If the above interpretations of Holy Writ be sound, and they are independent, and were not made to support a theory, a cumulative force is given to evidence on behalf of the teaching of the Church which raises our position to a high degree of probability. Whilst, if we measure such probability by the absence of all evidence producible on the other side, that the number of the sins must be calculated on a different basis, the probability against the first objection to the sevenfold order of the deadly sins mounts almost to certainty. And you will remember, my Brethren, that we are now only dealing with the sentimental objection against the Church's catalogue.

Secondly: There is the ethical difficulty to be considered; and this difficulty takes the following form: It is said, certain sins exist which are deadly and are *not* found in the catalogue of the seven capital sins; but if one such sin only may be named, it is of itself

sufficient to support a charge of imperfection against the order of the Church. And, of course, the sins which the objector has in mind, even if they do not pass his lips, are certain social sins, notably the sin of falsehood, possibly the sin of theft.

There are, however, two lines of thought to be indicated before we can conveniently meet the ethical objector to the sevenfold division of sin on his own ground.

I. We must not forget, though the Church has declared the number of the deadly sins to be seven, that she has so declared with full knowledge of the Ten Commandments of GOD. The two enactments indeed may be considered almost and practically co-ordinate. Where they ageee, they are identical in aim though diverse in form. Where they differ, they differ in practice rather than in principle. They stand in the same mutual relationship respectively as the Gospel stands to the Law. The one overlaps and fulfils the other. The second is contained in, is presupposed by, the first. And the last in order of time, as well as the second in point of authority, namely the catalogue of the Church, is to be understood as supplementing and not as supplanting the earlier and more binding, namely the Decalogue of GOD.

Moreover, no code of written law, either graven by the Finger of GOD or imposed by GOD'S Church, whether it apply to moral instinct or human action, can be absolutely exhaustive. Equally in the Church and in the World, there must ever exist both executive and judicial powers to adapt statutes to events, and to apply laws to cases as they arise. And though the principles of moral action are unaffected by the change of time and place, yet such principles have to be extended or modified in practice according to circumstances. The ingenuity of man can always evade standards of right or wrong which the ingenuity of man has prepared—nay, which the Omniscience of GOD has prepared. Even the Decalogue of the Creator, by the marvellous power of free will in the creature, may be disobeyed, though no command has been literally broken.

II. Taking a broad view of both lists of human wickedness, it may be urged that the Ten Commandments more or less ignore that side of morality which affects the inner life of man, as a responsible being endowed with self-consciousness; that the deadly sins more or less ignore those outward developments of evil which ensue from self-consciousness being disused, from responsibility being denied. As a formula which prevails with less precision than a law, the capital sins

are concerned with the source and origin of wickedness: the Commandments forbid its legitimate outcome and product. Moreover, from another point of view, it may be said that the first table of the Decalogue is wholly, and the second table is partially, assumed under the legislation of the deadly sins: and that where the two catalogues of sin assimilate, the one alludes to sinful habits, motives, or states of being, the other forbids definite, overt, and positive acts of sin.

These two lines of thought will help us to meet the objection that theft and falsehood, as social wickedness, are not included in the Church's index of the capital sins.

In the first place: If we consider the seven sins of the Church as supplementary to, rather than as supplanting the ten commands of GOD, two facts immediately appear. Not only is it evident, 1. that lying in one form and thieving of all kinds are definitely forbidden by the Commandments, and hence are inferentially condemned in the list of the sins: but also, 2. that theft which is one product of covetousness, and falsehood which may ensue from any capital sin, are both equally and positively hostile to the evangelical table. Nor are these the only sins which are either apparently overlooked, or avowedly dis-

regarded by one or both codes of moral law. For instance: Honour to one's parents, and whatever duties of social, political, or religious life ensue from the Sixth Commandment, are absolutely omitted from reference in the list of the deadly sins. And these obligations are omitted probably for a further reason than because they find a place in the Decalogue, namely, as forming the assumed basis at once of the natural, artificial, and supernatural phases of human life. Again: Under the elder dispensation the sin of rebellion, the sin of dealing with familiar spirits, and the sin of taking usury from a poor brother; or, as they are termed under the younger dispensation, lawlessness or disobedience, witchcraft, and extortion—three sins held in special abomination in the sight of GOD—find no place in definite terms in the decalogue of Mount Sinai. And once more, to mention a sin with which we, thank GOD, are only familiar by name: The sin of tyranny or despotism is forbidden under neither code of morality; and yet we, as Englishmen, distinctly hold it to be one of the very worst of political and social crimes.

In the second place: Two opposite opinions may be held of sin in relation to human wickedness. The acceptance of either of them is fatal to the objection, that the catalogue of the capital sins is incomplete.

First: The estimate of deadly sin which views it as the cause rather than as the effect of moral turpitude, is clearly illustrated from the case of the sin of falsehood—for we may, I think, suitably confine our attention to one only of the alleged imperfections in the catalogue of evil, and that the all-important example of lying. Here the contrast between the Mosaic code and the Evangelical law is apparent. Where the one forbids murder, the other condemns anger. Where the first says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," the last declares sensuality to be sinful. Where the Law particularises the goods of another which a man may not covet, the Gospel affirms of the spirit of covetousness, that it is of the nature of deadly sin. In each case, you will observe, Christianity attacks the principle of sin at its source and origin; Judaism curbs the development of sin in its result. And the case of falsehood is fairly comparable to these instances For falsehood, from the point of view whence we consider it, is less a consequence than a cause: falsehood is rather an aggregate of many, various, and often opposite influences, than an effect created by a given influence.

Take, for example, the sins one by one, and yourselves, judge my Brethren: A man may lie in exhibiting his pride, or in hiding his pride, or in ministering to his pride. And the sin of pride in its essence is only

one expression of falsehood towards GOD, or of falsehood towards man. It costs little to the envious or covetous man to depreciate his neighbour untruly, in his person, in his position, in his possessions, or in his fair fame. And, in this aspect, envy and covetousness are but varied forms of untruth. Under the influence of passion, a man will without hesitation magnify or diminish, suppress or deny, distort or ignore the truth. And anger, therefore, may be held to be one development of falsehood. Who has ever heard the glutton or impure—save in the lowest degree of either form of sensuality—when under the influence of sin and when charged with such influence, avow himself to indulge in either impurity or excess? And is it not evident of both these deadly sins, that they are the product of untruth: especially of the last of the capital sins; for, who can be true either to himself or to his victim, who can be true either to GOD or man, who is guilty of the awful sin of adultery?

Second: But deadly sin, in its relation to immorality, may be viewed more as an effect than as a cause. In this aspect it is difficult to imagine a falsehood being uttered apart from a cause which itself owes its origin, directly or indirectly, to some other form of wickedness. If this be allowed, the sin of lying differs in kind as well as in degree, from all other sin. Take

any of the deadly sins—envy, or sloth, or avarice. Under certain conditions these sins may be viewed, as we have in fact considered them, as arising from a good principle carried to excess, or perverted through distortion, or cramped by defect. But under no circumstances can falsehood be linked with holiness. No phase of holiness in deficiency, no phase of holiness in obliquity, no phase of holiness in extravagance can produce falsehood. And if we examine the matter with care, we shall become conscious, not only that falsehood has its source in each deadly sin, but that, apart from such sin, falsehood has no existence. A man, indeed, may be said to be false, to be unreliable, to be untrue, abstractedly and in general terms, yet he is thus described by a figure of speech only. He is not untrue in the same sense that he may be proud or envious, slothful, gluttonous or impure. His want of veracity will not have an object on which to exercise itself without temptation from one of the seven deadly sins. It will become actively energised only under the form of one of them. Even the apparently pointless lie, the practice of unpremeditated falsehood, or the habit of invention, exaggeration, suppression, or deceit, which has become almost a second nature, may be dictated by conceit or vanity, or be the result of some other sin.

Hence, it would appear that falsehood—and the same may be affirmed of theft—cannot be quoted as an instance of the imperfection of the sevenfold development of sin. Indeed it forms a marked example of the completeness of the catalogue, and of its perfection from a moral point of view. Had falsehood been pronounced to be the eighth capital sin, the list would have been scientifically incorrect. So far from falsehood being a deadly sin supplemental to or independent of the recognised seven, whether as cause or effect it is intimately connected with them all. Either the seven capital sins severally conspire to create untruth: or falsehood necessarily developes into the seven forms of deadly sin. In neither case can it be regarded as a self-contained sin which destroys the perfection of the Church's systematised arrangement.

IV.

With the consideration of these two omitted points in our theory about sin we will be content. Time fails us, to-day, to attempt more than the discussion

I. Of the interdependence and relationship between the seven deadly sins: and

II. Of the imperfection of their catalogue.

The words of the text, which speak of the Apocalyptic Beast named "Blasphemy," who rose up out of

the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, are suggestive, at the least, of some mystical connection between these two numbers, seven and ten, in relation to the "heads" of the deadly sins and the "horns" of the sins against the Commandments. But more need not be said than to point out the possibility of such interpretation to devout students of Holy Scripture who are imbued with the teaching of the Church.

In our next lecture I shall hope to discuss the first sin of the last division of the capital sins—those caused by excess of love. And the first of these sins is the deadly sin of avarice.

A. M. D. G.

LECTURE EIGHT.

OF THE DEADLY SIN OF AVARICE:

THE FIRST SIN OF LOVE EXCESSIVE.

"*The love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.*"

1 S. TIMOTHY, VI. 10.

I.

TO-DAY we enter upon the third and last division of the capital sins, in considering the sin of Avarice.

We have already discussed, you will remember, the case of one who loves evil to those whom he should love as himself, namely his neighbour. We have also estimated him who loves less than he might love the Highest Good, that is GOD. We have now, therefore, to examine the characteristics of the man who loves

more than he ought to love some lower good amongst created things. I need hardly remind you, that the distorter of love finds expression for his obliquity in the sins of pride, envy and anger; nor that the defaulter in love withholds his meagre service from GOD under the influence of sloth. But it may be well to enforce upon you once more, that the exceeder in love, the first of whose specialties we are now called upon to analyse, can offend in three several ways:

1. By the capital sin of avarice or covetousness:
2. By the capital sin of gluttony, or excess in eating and drinking:
3. By the capital sin of impurity, or in theological language, luxury or lust.

To these three developments in selfishness, consequent upon love which is imperfect and human, upon love which is in excess, rather than in defect or in obliquity, we will now turn. And the one thought, beyond a sense of duty, that helps us to persevere in our self-imposed task of annotating the deadly sins—a task which may be profitable, but certainly is not attractive—is the truth, that here also, as in other instances, relief may be found from the burden of sin: a fountain has been opened for sin and for all uncleanness. Here, as in other cases, light shines upon darkness that may be felt. For here too, perfect love is the

antidote to the poison of human selfishness, and the love of GOD within our hearts will keep us pure and undefiled. Let us pray the HOLY SPIRIT of Love, my Brethren, whilst we now venture to speak of and listen to, whilst we now think over and ponder upon, the sin of man which is more sensual in character than spiritual.

II.

Covetousness, as one of the capital sins, and as one form only of sin against the Tenth Commandment, may be defined to be that inordinate and selfish love of money which is otherwise called Avarice.

This love of money, which of course includes, and I shall take to mean, the love of money's worth, and what money may purchase, becomes sinful in at least four different ways, under two distinct conditions. We may sin by covetousness,

I. In regard to money which we actually possess; and

II. In relation to money of which we are not actually in possession.

Two results flow from each of these divisions. We may sin under the first head, namely, in regard to the money we possess,

1. By inordinate and selfish complacency in possessing

or spending our money—a complacency which shows itself by display, extravagance, or waste; or

2. By inordinate and selfish anxiety to hoard and save our money lest we should diminish it; and thus be guilty of parsimony.

We may sin under the second head, namely, in relation to money we do *not* possess, either

1. By inordinate and selfish eagerness to obtain more money, which issues in ceaseless thought and effort for its acquisition; or
2. By inordinate and selfish concern which follows the loss of our money, as if we had forfeited some real good—a concern which takes the form of dejection.

All these developments of avarice spring from imperfect love. The covetous man, who is an exceeder in love, loves more than he ought to love the lower good of created things, which in this case is money. And you will at once perceive, from the order in which the different forms of sin have been arranged, that covetousness arises from the extremes of two kinds of excess in love. The avaricious man loves what he has, and is either lavish or mean; or he loves what he has not, and either labours too much for its gain, or mourns too much for its loss.

We will consider these various forms of covetousness in order, at greater or lesser length.

III.

Two preliminary questions, however, must be discussed in the first place, which apply equally to either class of sinners by covetousness:

I. Who may be an avaricious man? and

II. How a man may be avaricious?

First: The avaricious man loves what he has, or loves what he has not, inordinately and selfishly. And this form of imperfect love may be developed in the hearts of members of every class of society. It is by no means confined to any single class. The rich are certainly subject to the temptation. But the poor are not at all free from its dangers. And those who enjoy a competency—that is, either a little more than they need, or a little less than they want—also feel its influence. The sin, then, does not consist in what we possess; but in the attitude which we assume towards our possessions. And Holy Scripture clearly endorses this view of the sin. It emphatically extends the limits of covetousness to each class of society. Of course, it is only a matter of experience, that the more a man possesses, the more occasions of temptation are open to him. But, it is equally a matter of fact that a

man may be tempted to avarice more vehemently, the fewer the number of his earthly goods. The more he wants, the more he may be tempted to covetousness.

This truth is forced upon our attention in a remarkable manner, by the words of our Blessed LORD Himself, as recorded in the Gospel according to S. Mark, and by their effect upon His disciples. When in their self-sacrificing simplicity the Apostles of the LORD JESUS listened to their Master's denunciations of covetousness, we read, simply, they "were astonished at His words." Their astonishment, apparently expressed in desire for further light, was met by our LORD by the explanation, that what He intended to convey was, the difficulty of attaining to bliss, not for those who were wealthy in the abstract, but for those who trusted in and depended upon their wealth. Here, we should have thought, the disciples ought to have been satisfied. It would commend itself to most minds, without causing surprise, that such men would find much difficulty in entering the kingdom of Heaven; even as a camel, in going "through the eye of a needle." Yet, strangely enough, this is not the thought which was uppermost in the minds of the Apostles. For, we read again, after their Divine Master had added this gloss upon His words, that the disciples "were astonished out of measure, saying

among themselves 'Who then can be saved?'" Nor does our LORD soften down His words, or explain away their meaning., He adds: "With men it is impossible; but not with GOD." Hence, my Brethren, we may conclude, that the universality of the danger, to rich and poor alike, is the measure of the extent of the temptation to trusting in worldly goods. Hence, we may learn, that none are exempt from the liability of falling into the deadly sin of covetousness.

This truth, that a man need not be a man of wealth to be covetous, that the bare possession of riches does not make him guilty of sin, is important to be insisted upon at the present day. It is important for two reasons: 1. because the extremes of both wealth and poverty are so widely separated; and hence it appears difficult to apply the same law to both: and also, 2. because the gradations of wealth and poverty are so indistinct; and hence it is often actually impossible to mark the distinction between them. The millionaire—as a generic term, one of a class of whom we have heard so much of late years—the millionaire who can leave behind him, mainly perhaps in self-acquired wealth, from a quarter of a million sterling to two or three millions of money, may be considered absolutely rich. The industrious mechanic who, from no fault of his own, has become an object of private benevolence; or the beggar

who prefers penury to the heartless charity of state-granted doles in workhouses which disgrace our country, the beggar may be considered absolutely poor.

But, how many shades are there, between wealth which appears to most of us fabulous, and poverty which, let us thank GOD, to many whom I see before me is almost equally imaginary? How many are there who have large incomes, moderate incomes, small incomes; and who is to say, which of them may be rich, and which of them may be poor? How many, again, are there, with variable, fluctuating, and uncertain incomes, sometimes large and sometimes small; with incomes which never rise beyond competency, and sometimes fall below it; without incomes at all, who now live in comparative affluence, and now in comparative indigence—and who is competent to decide between them, which may be accounted rich, and which may be accounted poor? It is a matter only of comparison. We are all rich, in comparison with our poorer brethren. We are all poor, in comparison with neighbours more wealthy than ourselves. Hence, to all of us, without exception, apply the words of our Blessed LORD, "Children, how hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of GOD." We may affirm, therefore, an avaricious man to be one who trusts in his possessions, be he wealthy, or be he poor.

Second: This disposes of the first prefatory question, Who an avaricious man may be? and this leads to the second inquiry, How may he be avaricious? And in the words, "Covetousness which is idolatry," the Apostle explains in what consists the deadly sin of avarice. Covetousness is a form of idolatry. It is, as S. Paul elsewhere explains, worshipping and serving "the creature more than the Creator, Who is blessed for ever. Amen." It is the love of money more than the love of GOD. The covetous man, therefore, is an idolater. And this scriptural decision on the position of avarice in the Christian warfare supports the position which the vice occupies in the theory of the deadly sins, which we are attempting to perfect. For, by the definition we have formulated, the covetous man is an exceeder in love. And of those who love more than they ought to love some lower good in created things, the man who loves money or money's worth selfishly and inordinately is covetous. Such an one is declared by Holy Scripture to be an idolater.

How does the sin of the idolatry of covetousness display itself? This is a question which we shall endeavour to answer at more length further on. But it is one which may be summarised here. In few words, it makes a God of money. The covetous

man is a worshipper of Mammon; and his duty towards his money-God, may, without a thought of anything but divine irony, be thus described. The duty of the covetous man towards mammon is first to believe in it, next to fear it, and then to love it. He must love, he must fear, he must believe his money-God, with all his heart, with all his mind, with all his soul, and with all his strength. But he must do more. The avaricious man must worship his money-God; he must call upon his majesty, as the worshippers of Baal called, from morn to eve; he must honour his Satanic name and Satanic word; and he must serve him truly all the days of his life.

Does it strike any reverent mind, that such a burlesque savours of the profane? I would answer: It is the Apostle S. Paul who tells us, that covetousness is idolatry and the worship of money. It is the Prayer-book which concisely tells us what is our duty towards ONE Whom to worship is not idolatry. I simply apply to S. Paul's judgment the test of the Catechism: and I ask you that hear me, is such description a fair, or is it an exaggerated account of the devotee of mammon? I firmly believe that such estimate is true. Experience of others, self-knowledge, observation in the world, confirms the opinion, that such estimate is true; true to the life

of poor, fallen, weak humanity; true to human nature regenerated indeed, but fallen again by actual sin to that last state which is infinitely worse than the first. And the sentence of the Wise Man confirms this application of S. Paul's judgment, expressed in the language of the Catechism. There is not, he says, "there is not a more wicked thing than a covetous man: for, such an one setteth his own soul to sale." Yes, my Brethren, here we find an answer to the question: How a man may be avaricious? The answer is this. The man who inordinately and selfishly loves more than he ought to love that lower good which we call money, is an idolater of mammon, and is amongst the most wicked of created things; for he setteth his own soul to sale, even to sale to the devil. Thus may a man be avaricious.

IV.

Listen to a simple story, almost a parable, from the writings of the Saints.

It is related of a certain wealthy person living abroad, that his house adjoined the cottage of a poor day-labourer; and that his bed-chamber was so close to his neighbour's humble tenement, that the man of means could hear all that was said, and observe all that was done within it. And this was the result

of his observation. The rich man saw that the poor man was always cheerful and showed no sign of being heavy at heart. When he came home at night, tired with his day's work, he would light his fire, smoke his pipe, sing his song, talk to his wife, play with his children, and after his supper, would lay him down and take his rest in quietness and singleness of heart.

Turning to his own case and comparing it with that of the peasant, the wealthy man wondered that he could never feel the cheerfulness, could never feel the contentment, could never feel the mental peace of his poorer neighbour. His days were full of anxiety. His nights were constantly disturbed. His life was a burden to himself and a misery to others. While thinking over the contrast, it forced itself upon the gentleman that possibly it was his wealth which caused his own disquiet, that possibly it was the labourer's poverty which caused his peacefulness. To test the truth of his conclusion, the rich man adopted a simple artifice. He took a purse full of money, and one night placed it on the step of the poor man's door where he and none other would see it in the morning.

The rich man again watched his neighbour; and this was the result of his observation. The labourer got up as usual and on finding the purse was at first beside himself with joy. But shortly he became

anxious as to how he was to hide his treasure, and how he was to spend it. That day he did not go to work: but stayed at home and brooded over the matter. He was fearful that his friends should learn his secret; he was afraid to tell even his wife and children. He was ignorant how to conceal his newly found wealth; he did not even know how to spend it. And he could think of no other course than to hide the money in his bed and to lay himself down to keep guard upon it. From this time forward his peace of mind left the peasant. His songs were heard no more. He was sullen to his wife. He never played with his children. He became an altered man; and eventually took to his bed, for covetousness having possessed itself of his heart, next attacked his person as if by poison. The gentleman was now convinced that the poor man's peace of mind had been lost when the purse of money had been found. He called at the cottage; and on inquiry, was told by the wife, that her husband was in bed, ill with a pain in his side. "I will undertake to cure your husband," he said, and making his way to the bed-side of the money-sick patient, explained the device which he had adopted; recovered his purse of money; gave the poor man a handsome sum by way of recompense for what he had suffered; and went his way.

It is needless to add, that the poor man returned to his daily work a happier man; and that his wealthier neighbour returned to his inherited possessions a wiser, if not a better one.

V.

We are now in a position to deal with the four kinds of avarice which have been named. You will remember that they are these:

1. Inordinate and selfish complacency in having,
2. Inordinate and selfish anxiety in keeping,
3. Inordinate and selfish eagerness in getting,
4. Inordinate and selfish concern in losing,

the God of the covetous man, money. And this form of idolatry may be concisely expressed in four verbal characteristics—love, fear, desire, distress. Of two of these results of covetousness, namely fear of lessening the money we possess, and distress at losing the money we have acquired, I purpose to say but little, in order to devote more time to the other two, namely, the love of mammon and the desire of gain. But a few words may not be out of place upon covetous parsimony and avaricious dejection, in the first instance.

These two forms of mammon-worship bear a family

likeness to each other. It does not always follow, but there is a tendency towards both forms of covetousness, in the case of the acquisition of money by our own efforts. I do not say that the inheritors of wealth are always generous, and the creators of capital are always wanting in generosity. Such a statement would be untrue and absurd. But, all else being equal, there is undoubtedly a tendency in self-made men (as they are called) towards over-saving the dearly-bought gains of toil, which does not affect so closely or in the same way the man who is born to what his father made or what his father left. Again: I do not say that inheritors of property can always lose with equanimity and dignity, or that makers of their own fortune need always lose with unmanly concern the possessions upon which, in either case, the heart is fixed. This would be foolish to affirm. But, again, all else being equal, there is more tendency to dejection, when the result of honest work is lost, than when bequeathed wealth only fails. And this is true, in spite of possibly greater energy, greater capacity, and greater zeal, to repair the loss in the money-maker, than falls to the share of the inheritor of money. In both cases, it is hard to part from the idol of the soul, either by one's own free gift, or by actions over which, perhaps, we can exercise

no control. In both cases, covetousness is the cause of the sensation.

It is, perhaps, scarcely worth while to compare or contrast these two forms of mental covetousness, when both are bad. Yet, their salient points may be indicated. And it will be seen by one who analyses this form of imperfect love, that there is a meanness about the miserly disposed, which the dejected man need not feel; and there is a want of manliness about losing without dignity, which the parsimonious need not feel. The results, however, taken by sin are as different as their forms. The covetous man who is mean and parsimonious withholds from those who have a claim on him, and ill-requites those who have done him service. He is ungenerous towards friends, grasping in business with others, and hard upon dependants. He is heartless upon the needs of others; neglects the calls of charity; turns his back upon his Maker and His service; and even denies himself what his position in society demands, without being chargeable with extravagance. On the other hand, the avaricious man, who loses heart when he loses money, has no character worthy of admiration. As in the present day, more money, perhaps, is made by living, than is left by dead men, it seems the more unworthy, that money lost in the endeavour to

make further money should be a cause of despondency to the avaricious. Of course, when loss occurs from causes beyond the victim's control, much that might be otherwise urged has no place. Yet, even here, the man who sees in the ordinary concerns of life the over-ruling dispositions of a particular Providence, will be careful, how the loss of mere worldly good produce a double evil; and inflict upon him, over and above loss of money, additional and more real evil, in the misery of an unquiet and dejected spirit.

We will now turn from the consideration of anxiety in keeping money and of concern in losing money to these two forms of covetousness: 1. Selfish and inordinate complacency in having possessions, and 2. Selfish and inordinate eagerness in getting them.

This will lead us to touch on that aspect of the idolatry of avarice which creates love of and desire for mammon. And we will annotate the covetous man who is engaged in securing the object of his worship, before we estimate him in the possession of it.

VI.

I. The covetous man sins against the divine law of love, when inordinate and selfish eagerness to obtain more money issues in ceaseless thought and

effort for its acquisition. Let us consider one form of such covetousness in the light in which it may strike a Christian member of society, namely, speculation. Now, speculation is a word of doubtful significancy, and of double meaning. It may be used indifferently both in a good and in a bad sense; may be applied to small transactions and to large, with equal truth. It is speculation to buy commodities of every-day life, in never so small a way, in the cheapest market, and to sell them in the dearest. It is speculation to traffic in bond and share and scrip at the Exchange by hundreds and thousands of pounds at a venture. In a certain sense, all trade and all business may be termed speculation; and none can offer to sell what another may wish to buy, without an element of speculation. But with the element of speculation in the ordinary and commonplace transactions of buying and selling, I am not now concerned. I would limit our attention to that phase of money-making which is connected less with legitimate commerce than with the accidental or even anticipated rising and falling in public prices or private securities. And how may such speculation be defined, from a point of view other than a speculator's? If we analyse the matter with care we come to this conclusion, that speculation which is not

based upon certainty, and which, in fact, is successful speculation, may be described as the enrichment of ourselves at the expense of our neighbours.

These two conditions are made advisedly. For, speculations which are failures come under another category. And speculations which are not *bonâ fide* transactions deserve a very different title. But such as are genuine and successful may thus be fairly described. It matters not at all, whether such enrichment of ourselves at the expense of others proceed from an area which is incalculably wide, so that it is difficult to determine the insignificant loss of any individual unit; or whether advantage is gained in large sums from few persons. It matters not, whether a decimal part of a penny be added a hundredfold on an article of commerce bought by the million; or whether the stocks rise or fall, by which thousands of pounds are realised by the stroke of a pen, which ensures judicious purchase or sale. The result is the same in either case. Finance is not solely a paper transaction. Paper indeed represents gold; but gold-leaf falls not like manna from heaven. Hence, no purse is filled by speculation without some pocket being emptied. No fortune is made by speculation without another fortune, or many other fortunes, being proportionately marred. And the speculator is one

who seeks to secure his own advantage in the money market, at the expense either of some other or of many others.

Observe, Brethren, I do not presume to offer any opinion on the morality of such a profession, as a profession. I do not question it; and am content to accept it as an acknowledged outlet of commercial energy. And, in the manifold division of human labour, there must be those whose business it is to organise the supply in proportion to the demand for money, as well as those who are enabled to furnish the sinews of mercantile transactions. There must be speculators as well as capitalists. And I only wish to point out the bearings of the term 'speculation,' in order to indicate the possible dangers which may attach to the profession of money-making. I only desire to show to what results inordinate and selfish eagerness to obtain more money actually leads, namely, to the enrichment of ourselves at the cost of our neighbours.

There are, however, many persons, in these days, who speculate without being speculators—I mean, mere dabblers in speculation, dilettante financiers, men, and women too, who do not take up money-making as a profession; who do not study and know nothing of the science of finance, in a business-like way; and who are, or ought to be, otherwise and sufficiently

engaged in their own special occupation. Such as these wish to make a small capital do the work of a large income. Of course, this pecuniary feat can only be performed by obtaining an abnormal and dangerously high rate of interest. But high interest is only another name, as has been well said, for bad security. Hence, these amateur speculators who realise this fiscal truth are kept in a perpetual state of monetary excitement and change. They vary their investments according to the signs of the times which they vainly endeavour to decipher; and their feelings vary with the fluctuations of the money-market, which they are unable to account for, and are powerless to predict. To this class of speculators, perhaps, more than to any other, apply the larger part of the evidences of covetousness. For they not only, as a rule, display inordinate and selfish eagerness to obtain more money, but they feel inordinate and selfish love for the money which they possess; are beset by inordinate and selfish anxiety to save it; and are haunted by inordinate and selfish concern if it be lost. By them, therefore, the true meaning of speculation should be earnestly considered. To them, especially, is the explanation offered. For, without the sanctions of professional responsibility, and apart from their own legitimate calling in life, they—the amateur speculators—increase

their own incomes solely at the expense of the incomes of other persons.

Inordinate and selfish eagerness to increase wealth may, however, be the temptation of both classes of speculators, the professsional and the amateur. And what may be the symptoms of the temptation? Take but a few of them. The speculator is always on the look out for an opportunity of making money; "turning an honest penny," as he calls it. Nothing is too vast for his untiring energies; nothing is too small to escape his keen observation. The advertising columns of the daily papers give evidence of the height, in public schemes, to which he soars. The plans of one's friends indicate the littleness of detail to which he allows himself to descend. Is it the preservation of animal food at the other side of the globe, or the supply of pure milk at home? Is it a new method of producing heat and light, by gas or fuel, at our own doors? Is it one of the endless new forms of life-assurance? Is it to counteract alleged extravagance of profit in the retail business of objects of daily, hourly domestic use, or of articles of more costly worth? Is it to obviate the discomfort of a sea-voyage, or to increase the comfort of locomotion by land? It matters not. Men can always be found to provide money with a view to increase; to give money in order to make more.

Nor is this eagerness to make money confined to public enterprise. There is a fair chance if one accidentally overhears a conversation in the street, it is certain if you are in society with friends, at one time or another, that the talking turns or will turn on the question of prices—the price of meat, of bread, of hay, of coal; the increase of rent or wage; the difficulty of saving; the decrease of grain; the hardness of the times. Of course, there is a right side to all this eagerness: and of this side, I say nothing. Money both represents and supplies means of life. Economy, or the making the best and fullest possible use of GOD'S gifts, or man's labour, is a matter of duty. And public enterprise, or private care, enables persons to live; the same people with greater comfort; more people with the like comfort; both with larger powers to give to GOD. Hence, some thought about money is not only allowable, but needful. The only question is: How much thought may lawfully be bestowed upon this state of existence, and its means of support? It is a difficult question, hard to be answered. But a reply must be given: and I would venture to answer it by accommodation, thus:

The sin of covetousness arises when you love more than you ought to love the lower good of created things, which is, or is the product of, money. When

your public actions, or private efforts, tend to make you love money instead of, more than, or even in addition to GOD—then, you are in danger—I say no more, but you are in danger—from the sin of covetousness. When you can think of little or nothing else, care for little or nothing else, take interest in little or nothing else, speak of little or nothing else, than speculation—then, you are in danger of covetousness. Again: When money or money-making comes mentally before you in your holiest hours, in communing with your GOD; when your collectedness is disturbed by it, your prayers are distracted by it, your meditations are interrupted by it, your worship is hindered by it; when you confess the feeling over and over again, and yet, over and over again have to seek absolution for the fault—then, you are in danger of covetousness. Once more: When mammon and its temptations have your last thoughts, or even keep you awake at night, visit you in sleep, come to you in your first conscious moments, and continue with you throughout the day: when complacency in possession, or elation in getting, or anxiety in saving, or dejection at loss, disturb the even tenour of your inner being—then you are in danger of covetousness. When, lastly, you make money so fast for yourself and your family, or when you save money so little for GOD and His

Church, or when you lose money so quickly to your fellow man that, under any of these circumstances, you become hard and selfish, unloving or unsympathetic, or careless about giving a tithe of what you possess in charity—then, once more, Brother or Sister in CHRIST, you are in danger of falling, even if you have not already fallen into the deadly sin of covetousness, which, as the Apostle says, is idolatry.

VII.

II. The covetous man sins against the divine law of love when inordinate complacency in possessing or spending money results in the worship of mammon. Of these two forms of covetousness, avarice in possession, or belief in, reliance on, or devotion to money, comes under the head of the sin of pride of possession. This gives us additional evidence of a truth which we considered in our last lecture, namely that the interdependence of the deadly sins is intimate. For, here we see, how closely allied covetousness is to pride; allied to this extent, that one development of avarice is identical with a certain form of pride. On this point, therefore, nothing further need be said. In the remaining kind of avarice, spending our money, the worship of mammon may take at least three distinct forms, namely, 1. of display, 2. of extravagance, and

3. of waste. And upon these I purpose to offer only a few general remarks upon first principles.

These three forms of the worship of mammon may be, and often are, but three aspects of a single act. Thus: The intention of any given action may be to cause display; the matter of the action may be extravagant; the result of the action may be wasteful. But the terms may also refer to three independent acts: and of these, perhaps, waste in the service of mammon combines the greatest amount of evil, with the least amount of compensating advantage. Some defence may be urged for extravagance, if not done for mere display, on behalf, at least, of those who directly or indirectly benefit by the circulation of money. But, there are few palliative circumstances to be admitted in favour of waste. Indeed, things wasted are doubly lost. They are lost by their own absence of utility. And loss also ensues from the use in their stead of the object which takes their place. And by waste, I mean not employing things to the greatest advantage, and to the fullest extent. In which description we may see the difference between the prodigality of Nature, and the waste of thoughtless man, in will if not in deed. Nor did our Blessed LORD fail to teach His disciples the virtue of making the most of the gifts of His divine hand, even when supernaturally supplying the lower needs of man's

organisation. "Gather up the fragments that remain," is the command of CHRIST after miraculously feeding the five thousand, "that nothing be lost." If, then, our Divine Master was pleased to let nothing fail in its use, which Himself had created even out of the usual course of Nature with unsparing superfluity; shall it not be our part to withstand, in opposition to the worship of mammon, that want of adaptation of means to end, which can never be commended, and which we call waste?

Again: Extravagance is a form of avarice which often is a companion of useless waste. But, there are qualifying circumstances attending the matter, if not the manner of this sin. Much that goes by the name of extravagance is simply the distribution of money by wealthy men in channels other than the objector, or even other than the supposed requirement of Political Economy, considers the best channels of distribution. Into this subject, which is a question more to be decided by political science than by the science of morality, I will enter no further than to say thus much: Extravagance is a sin of varying import, and what may be sin in one man may be harmless in another. Money spent in extravagance can with difficulty be wasted. It might be better spent; but it is not lost. For instance: There are many articles of

manufacture not absolutely essential either to the well-being or to the comfort of the human race. It may be, or it may not be, an act of extravagance in any given person to make himself possessor of such luxuries. But the money spent upon them helps to support the artisan and his family employed on its production: and if everyone surceased from buying such objects of industry, those whose work in life consists in the production of them would be, amongst many others, the immediate sufferers. Still, undoubtedly, the sin of extravagance does lie against some, against many, in the act only of wrong distribution of money, or of its circulation in bad channels. When, however, we pass from this view of the subject to consider the motive with which money is caused to change hands, the motive on which mammon worship is based becomes eminently sinful. Whatever may be the circumstances of the man who is charged with extravagance, whatever may be the result which ensues from the change of money-ownership, if the act be done with a view to mammon worship, it bears the stamp of deadly sin. And that in untold cases in this vast city, amongst both rich and poor, the cultus of mammon under this form of avarice is widely popular, needs, my Brethren, no words of mine to enforce.

Lastly, in the threefold development of avarice in

spending, comes the sin of display. This form of covetousness is confined to the intention; and an act which may not be extravagant in one person, nor wasteful in another, may yet be chargeable with display, if done with a bad motive. Indeed, it is the motive which determines the fact, as well as a large portion of the amount of guilt of, though it does not alone decide the punishment due to the sin of avarice. When the motive is vitiated by the desire of display for the sake of mitigating personal drawbacks of which we are conscious, or of keeping up appearances which we already possess, or of gaining social advantages of which we are emulous, it is sinful. When display is employed for the sake of imposing upon our inferiors, surpassing our equals, or rivalling our superiors, it is sinful. When display is used for the sake of concealing our meanness in other ways, or of magnifying our gains, or of diminishing our loss, it is sinful. In any and in all of these ways, the sin of covetousness is developed from the imperfect love of the lower good of created things. And such excess of love for money, or money's-worth, may truly be called the worship of mammon.

VIII.

To conclude: We have thus stated or considered,

with more or less fulness, the four kinds of covetousness, the love, the fear, the desire, the distress, occasioned by avarice. We have stated or analysed the character of the covetous man, under the fourfold influence 1. of complacency in having, 2. of anxiety in keeping, 3. of eagerness in getting, and 4. of concern in losing money. And by money, we have agreed to understand what money may purchase, money's worth, mammon. The covetous man, we have seen, be he rich or be he poor, is one who trusts in his possessions: and he who makes an idol of his possessions is a covetous man. We have also seen, that all these forms of avarice come from one source, excess of love towards the lesser good of created things. Hence, we may learn in this case, again, and it is more than a play upon words, that love being the principle of human action, and selfishness being the origin of human sin; covetousness, the first of the developments of imperfect love in excess, can only be counteracted by the antidote of the poison of self, which is divine love.

How do these truths meet with us in practice, in the common concerns of every-day life? They meet with us in this way: The love which sees in created things only an evidence of GOD'S undeserved goodness, and which loves created things in GOD and for GOD,

is able to perceive intellectually, and to work out practically in his daily life, the truth that man is but the trustee or steward of the manifold gifts of His bounteous hand. The realisation of this truth will produce two results, one passive and one active:

1. The money which is Another's, and not our own, we shall neither love to keep, nor fear to lessen; we shall not feel over-much desire for its increase, nor over-much pain at its diminution. It is GOD'S money. Let Him do with it as seemeth Him best. Such in a few words is the passive result of the truth, in our minds.

2. But it will produce, also, an active result, in our lives. If we are stewards only or trustees, and not absolute owners of GOD'S gifts, it is clear that we are bound by our duty to act towards such gifts as He, the Almighty donor, may ordain. A trustee under the provisions of a human will of a deceased friend, would not question such a principle. The stewards of GOD'S gifts to man, under a divine Testament, must also accept it. And mark this, man possesses only a just claim for his own use, to nine-tenths of the wealth, be it much or little with which GOD has blessed him. The tenth part is GOD'S. He must give back to GOD, to GOD'S Church, to GOD'S poor, one-tenth part of what GOD has vouchsafed to place at

man's disposal. Such was the ordinary custom of the Jews; and we have yet to learn that the divine command for such tithings has been either withdrawn by GOD Himself directly, or mediately modified by His Church. It is true that tithes of all we possess may no longer be exacted by the Church on the authority, so to say, of divine statute law, nor by the fear of punishment from human secular law. But the custom is still a living part of the common law of the Catholic Church.

It is here worthy of note, though too much stress may not be laid on the circumstance, that the hard things against the sin of covetousness which appear in the pages of Holy Scripture, appear in the New, rather than in the Old Testament. They appear, that is to say, at a time when the requirement to pay tithes became legally obsolete, though they were still morally binding; when tithes ought to be paid, but were not enforced. The Gospel, no doubt, is a religion of liberty. But, the liberty which the Gospel proclaims, is liberty by GOD'S grace to do good, to which a reward is attached; not license from the Wicked One to do evil, without punishment following. And liberty to do good is hardly fulfilled, in such matters, by a Christian doing less of free will than a Jew was constrained to do of obligation.

Nor is this principle one which may not be enforced upon those who enjoy the privilege of worshipping in 'free and open' Churches. A 'free Church,' it cannot be too plainly said, is not a church in which persons who can give are free to give nothing. Few greater moral mistakes can be made. It is free, GOD be thanked, to all who are able to give nothing. It is not free to any who can give something—free, in the sense that they are not bound to give according to their means. They who can give—and how many are they amongst us who are blessed with competency—are bound to give, voluntarily, at least as much as—perhaps even more than—they would have both willingly given and paid of obligation, had the church not been made free. And why? By the law and in the spirit of self-sacrifice: that they may give for those who are powerless to give for themselves. The rich must pay for the freedom and liberty of the poor in a 'free and open Church.' We must not forget this moral obligation in theory. In practice we must not relax our efforts to continue the services and work of the church in which we worship at their highest possible perfection. In every 'free and open Church' that is built, and much more that is endowed, we have a noble instance of generous disinterestedness as a model which, after our measure, we may follow. Let us see to it, my Brethren, that

we fail not in our personal self-sacrifice to carry on with equal generosity and not less nobility, a work for GOD and souls begun in a spirit of self-abnegation.

We admit, then, the fact which few are disposed, in set terms, to deny, however little they may act up to their admission, that we are only stewards of GOD'S gifts of money and money's worth. If this admission be valid, the result which follows, namely the practice of conforming to GOD'S own law of human possession, by devoting a tithe of our income to His service, will prove to be one of the greatest preservatives against the deadly sin of covetousness. A thank offering to GOD, for the power and means of giving back to the Giver of all Good, will enable us to love Him, the Highest Good, more completely, with a perfect and divine love; will enable us to love the lower good of created things, as it is meet, with imperfect and human love. It will prevent the worship of mammon, which is idolatry, by checking our complacency in having, by lessening our anxiety in keeping, by moderating our eagerness in getting, and by solacing our concern in losing the money in regard to which, in His goodness, GOD has made us overseers.

A. M. D. G.

LECTURE NINE.

OF THE DEADLY SIN OF GLUTTONY:

THE SECOND SIN OF LOVE EXCESSIVE.

"*There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day . . . And in hell he lift up his eyes being in torments.*"

S. LUKE XVI. 19, 23.

I.

THE sixth of the deadly sins, and the second of the sins which owe their origin to an excess of love for the lower good of created things, is the capital sin of Gluttony. And the sin of gluttony consists in an inordinate and selfish desire for the sensual pleasure which arises from the gratification of eating and drinking.

From this definition of the sin, it appears that gluttony, when the desire developes into action, may take a double form under a single title:

1. In regard to the food we eat; and
2. In regard to the sustenance we drink.

In neither of these forms do I purpose to discuss the extreme limits to which the sin may be carried. It would be out of place, in lecturing to the congregation which is collected within these walls. It would be needless, living in the phase of society of which we find ourselves members. It would be out of place in this church: for, if any of us feel ourselves to be guilty of the sin of gluttony, in either of its two forms, we feel ourselves to be guilty, I will venture to say, my Brethren, more in the germ and less in the expansion of the vice. It would be needless, also, to discuss the extremes of gluttony, in either form, with society at large as we find it constituted at the present day. Society, in its varied and opposite developments, from both its bad and its good side, is simply intolerant of the sin when coarsely exaggerated, or vulgarly displayed. It is either too superficially cultivated, or too deeply refined; it is either too falsely respectable, or too truly religious; it is either too much afraid of the sentence of the world, or too careful about GOD'S verdict, to connive at, much less to indulge in over-eating or excess in drink, in the common acceptance of both terms. And for this amount of support from society on behalf of the prin-

ciple, if not of the practice of asceticism, though the motive may not be the highest, we Churchmen are bound to feel thankful.

On these grounds I do not intend to discuss the vice of gluttony in its extreme development. This limitation will at once relieve us of many difficulties in our examination of the capital sin from this place. And there is another limitation which will also tend to make our efforts in dealing with gluttony more easy. I do not propose to consider the sin, in either of its aspects, as a corporate sin, that is as a sin of or against society, or any section of it. I would rather consider it as a personal sin, that is as the sin of an individual Christian against his own soul—against his own soul, even rather than against his GOD. And my reason for not discussing gluttony as a social or corporate vice is two-fold.

Firstly: Because sins against society in the abstract, or sins of society against itself, can be treated in such general terms only, that all individuality is lost by the breadth of treatment. Definiteness is forfeited as the penalty for comprehension. And this truth has been exhibited with singular and lamentable force of late years, in the case of one element of gluttony, namely, excess in drink. Drunkenness has positively flourished under the influence of general denunciations, as a sin

of or against society; or of prohibitions based on social as distinct from religious grounds. It has flourished to such an extent that the state has been forced to legislate, and the Church is preparing to second the legislation upon more definite and individual treatment, if not upon a more distinctly religious recognition of the enormity of the sin.

Secondly: We will consider gluttony as a personal sin as distinct from a sin against society, because society, in any of its manifold developments, is sufficiently powerful to be left to its own guardianship; and gluttony in food or drink is, or has a tendency to become a social vice. We may reasonably feel indisposed to undertake the defence of an organization, which at least in its worldly phase, is probably indifferent to our advocacy on any terms, and certainly would decline our interference if enforced upon Catholic principles.

It is, therefore, with the vice as a personal sin, as an individual offence against our own soul, that I desire to deal with that form of gluttony which has to be considered; as a sin into which, Brother or Sister in CHRIST, you or I are personally liable to fall, into which you or I, GOD forgive us, may have personally fallen.

II.

We have, then, to deal with gluttony under a two-fold aspect;

1. As an individual, personal sin; and

2. As a sin indulged to an extent which falls short of excess.

Consider for a moment both positions in general terms. From the nature of the case, corporate efforts against the sin must needs be made against such a vice as gluttony, when sin has become developed in society as a body, by habitual excess. Neither parliamentary interference, nor the action of philanthropic societies can successfully wage war upon, or indeed would attempt to attack this capital sin in an exceptional phase. Moderated self-indulgence in eating or drinking by single persons is outside the scope of political or social action. Physical force to protect any given man against his own vice, and even philanthropic arguments levelled against the evils of intemperance in the case of many men, could hardly be applied to cases in which the sin does not rise, at worst in the world's estimate, above harmless, and at most, under any circumstances, to occasional self-indulgence. It is the more needful, therefore, I may almost say, it is the more essential for Religion to charge herself with the task of warning

individual souls of the danger of self-indulgence in moderation and in small matters. For self-indulgence in moderation and small matters, by the inevitable law of development, will surely lead to indulgence in matters of moment and even excess. And the sin of individual souls will possess every chance of being multiplied on a wider human field; for such sins, as the sin of gluttony, are unhappily infectious.

Nor is it paradoxical to say, that the earlier stage of indulged gluttony is the more dangerous to the individual soul than the later habit. Apart from the physical results which attend habitual want of self-command in either division of the sin of gluttony, systematic indulgence which is extreme is obviously hostile to the interests of spirituality. It requires no inspired prophet of GOD to warn us, that excess in the use of food, whereby our bodily health is endangered or impaired, is absolutely sinful. It needs no human director of souls to assure us, that intemperance in the use of drink, to the extent of clouding or injuring GOD'S highest gift to the natural man—the gift of self-consciousness—is not sinless. But it does need superhuman decision, it does require Scriptural authority, to condemn excess and intemperance which avowedly, and perhaps deliberately fall short of these extremes. The sudden withdrawal of the

veil between this world and the next, before the eyes of man by GOD Himself, alone will awaken persons of the comfortable classes, high or low, to a sense of the danger of doing nothing more sinful than giving way to systematised sensuality, even short of extremes. An inspired pencil alone can depict the rich glutton in hell-fire, as the due punishment for his sin of unmortified and habitual self-indulgence, which could not be taxed with absolute excess.

The parable of Dives and Lazarus is one which comes home to many of us who enjoy the blessing, and yet are exposed to the danger of living in a state of competency. The plain and unconventional mode of treatment, by inspiration, of the sin of gluttony which it contains deserves our careful attention. It supports the argument, otherwise paradoxical, that the earlier stage of indulged sin, which is content with moderation and falls short of excess, is the more dangerous to the individual soul. For observe, no vice is laid to the charge of the rich man: no vice but one, and that in terms which do not necessarily involve excess; no vice but one, and that not directly named, but incidentally mentioned in the way of historical narration. The rich man "fared sumptuously every day." And yet, his punishment is by no means vague. It is distinct and definite:

I may add that it is condign and awful. He is seen "in torments." He declares himself to be "tormented in this flame." His case, of course, included both forms of gluttony. He was self-indulgent, and so far as we know, only moderately self-indulgent, in both solid and liquid means of natural sustenance. Nor are we told that his style of living, to use the language of the day, was outside his means; nor that living within his income, he gave way to undue excess. For he was a rich man, "clothed in purple and fine linen," who "fared sumptuously every day." And if his, my Brethren, was the punishment of few stripes of one who knew not his LORD'S will, what shall be the punishment of many stripes of one who knows his LORD'S will and performs it not? "If the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?"

III.

This leads us to another preliminary question. Neither form of the sin of gluttony presents attractive features for consideration. Neither presents features otherwise than repulsive. But this is, or ought to be, no special peculiarity of the vice which we are considering. To a Christian man, anger or envy or sloth, are not, or ought not to be, pleasing sins

to discuss. Nay, they are eminently un-pleasing. The peculiar painfulness, however, of the two-fold sin of gluttony lies, perhaps, in the fact of its affecting, and of its being affected by, the lower part of our composite nature, the part which, up to a certain point, we possess in common with the animal creation. This is the question which next demands our attention.

To an extent, and only to an extent, need we share in the opinion which underlies this prevailing and popular sentiment. Nor does it follow that such singularity arises from attachment to sins of the animal class beyond those of a less fleshly character. But, we cannot fail to remember, that all sin is hateful, more hateful than sinful man can imagine, in GOD'S sight. We cannot recall evidence to show that He hates, with more holy and just indignation, sensual than spiritual sins. Indeed, from two equally clear evidences of His Almighty will and pleasure, if we may venture to judge in the matter, we might say, that since GOD punishes both alike, sins against the flesh and sins against the spirit are both equally loathsome in His All-pure eyes. The sin of pride, which is almost entirely a spiritual sin, cost heaven to Lucifer. Hell was the fate of a certain rich man, for a sin almost entirely sensual, the sin of gluttony.

And it is noteworthy, in confirmation of this opinion, to observe an Apostolic injunction. When S. Paul would mention the deadly sins which should not so much as fall by name from lips once purpled with the Precious Blood, he does not confine our silence, as many would confine it, to the sin of impurity. He extends his prohibition to the sin also of avarice. Thus, the inspired Saint places on an equality, from one point of view, sins which are more or less spiritual, and sins which are more or less sensual in character. "All uncleanness," are his words, "and covetousness, let it not be once named among you, the faithful in CHRIST JESUS, as becometh saints."

The sensation, disagreeable to all minds, and specially painful to some, with which sins of the flesh —gluttony for instance—are viewed, arises perhaps from the supposition that they assimilate their victims to the condition of the beasts that perish. On the possibility of such assimilation, as a matter of fact, something will be said hereafter. But at present, and for myself, I may say, that granting the possibility, I fail to see any absolute or peculiar degradation in the comparison. Man's composite nature is the common ground of meeting between the higher forms of organisation, as they are considered, of the Angel-host, and the lower forms of organisation, as they are

called, of the animal creation. The terms, higher and lower forms, are used with qualification. For, I am not prepared to affirm, for instance, that the marvellous mechanism of insect life which the microscope alone can disclose: or the organic adaptation of means to end, which the human intellect cannot always follow in thought, even when perceived in fact, in higher forms of creation; or again, the gift of instinct, or even the power of reason, exhibited in understanding, memory and will, in still higher developments of the animal world—I cannot affirm that such features in insect or animal life are evidences of a lower class of organisation. Rather, we should be disposed to think of such efforts of creation—if Almighty power and Infinite wisdom is capable of comparison—that a larger and higher and more perfect effort of creative power was needed in order to originate an organisation which possessed these features, than one which possessed them not

But, however we may allot the different efforts of creative power between an organisation in which the spirit is dominant, such as GOD'S Angels, and one in which the flesh appears to reign supreme, such as GOD's animal creation; there can be no doubt that the highest effort of GOD'S power was reserved for the act of creation which combined these two elements

with a third, even more precious than either, in the person of man. Man expresses the union of body and spirit with soul. He is the only being in the universe, of which we are conscious, that combines them all. The third element may be neglected on the present occasion. But of man's two-fold nature it may be affirmed, that it is analogous on the one hand to the nature of the beasts that perish, and on the other to that of the Angels who see GOD and live. If therefore, there be nothing essentially evil in animal nature, which it would be profane and absurd to suppose, our own bodily powers and functions which we share with the lower forms of creation, give us a positive superiority over the higher forms which lack such organisation. These last are wanting in at least one element of man's composite perfection.

But there is one more thought which may be placed before you in regard to the question of man's degradation by reason of his animal propensities. We were made, indeed, in common with the brute creation, of the dust of the ground. But we were also made, in certain spiritual qualities, a little lower only than the Angel-host. And it is in the union of features peculiar to the lower and higher forms of creation respectively, features which are common to

neither, that man has his own special dignity, his own special honour. Observe, my Brethren, we were made, that is, the natural man was made, a little lower, and a little lower only than the Angels. But when he was once re-made by sacramental power, when continually renewed by sacramental grace, then man became, not a little lower, but a great deal higher in the scale of creation than the Angel-host. For, unto which of the Angels said GOD at any time, even in a secondary sense, as He is pleased to say to us as members of the Only-Begotten : "Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten thee" in holy Baptism? Of which of the Angels or Archangels or of all the blessed company of heaven can it, in any sense, be said as in the most Holy Eucharist it may truly be said of us, that he is a member of CHRIST'S "Body, of His Flesh, and of His Bones"?

From these facts both in science and also in theology we see that any degradation we may contract by our animal relationship, is more than atoned by our angelic affinities, is more than obliterated by our sacramental union with the GODHEAD. Nor must it be forgotten, when we talk of our animal propensities, as if they were below the dignity of a rational being to entertain, that our Blessed LORD and SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, in His human relation-

ship, and sin only excepted, was and is exactly in our position. In whatever relationship man, in his lower organisation, may stand towards the animal creation, in the same relationship stands ONE Who was and is Perfect MAN as well as Perfect GOD. So that, if it be a degradation to human nature to have certain affinities with the nature of the beasts that perish, it is a degradation which we, as members of the Crucified, can without hesitation and most gladly share with our Divine Master. And mark this, my Brethren, the only way in which man—man as GOD has been pleased to constitute him—can possibly become united with the GODHEAD, by divine incorporation into the MANHOOD of CHRIST, is through the means, is through the medium of that lower organisation which we share in common with the animal creation.

Here I desire to distinguish. Certain sins have been spoken of as lowering mankind to the level of the beasts that perish. But I have spoken by accommodation only. Such a statement is neither true in the case of men, nor just in the case of beasts. It is not just towards GOD'S animal creation; for no animal can be subject, in a moral sense of the word and as a self-conscious being charged with responsibility, to vice—why, it is needless here to explain. We, men,

may, indeed, by a figure of speech, talk of the obstinacy of one animal, of the gluttony of another, of the laziness of a third, of the vanity of a fourth. But no one attributes to such creatures conscious moral imperfection, for which account will be required any more than he predicates moral perfection in others from qualities of industry, or wisdom, or patience, or fidelity. The animal simply obeys the law of its being which has been impressed upon it by an Almighty hand, and is unconscious alike of moral rectitude, or of moral obliquity. It is therefore unjust towards that portion of GOD'S creation which has not fallen from the standard of its creation, to compare its natural qualities which animal perfection demands shall be exerted, with the powers of mankind which are exercised only in a state of human imperfection. We do injustice to the animal creation, through the poverty of human language and confusion in human thought. We call that a vice in animals which may be compared with wickedness in man ; and we say that man, by debasing himself and degrading his nature, falls to the level of the brute which fulfils the object of its creation. But the truer and juster line to take with the animal world, that world which fulfils GOD'S will in the object of its existence, is rather this—to think and speak of such examples and patterns to man of GOD'S holy will per-

formed, as a great Saint spake and thought. S. Francis of Assisi's love for and intercourse with the animal world is touching to read of, and instructive. The humblest animals were his friends. The sheep and the hare and the ass were brothers. The bird and the bee were sisters.

But, if it be unjust to the animal world to say that certain sensual sins lower man to the level of the brute creation, it is untrue to affirm the same in regard to man. And it is untrue, because the assertion contains but a half-truth. The whole truth is only declared when we say, that such sins lower mankind, not to the level, but below, infinitely below the level of the beasts that perish. The reason of this is not obscure, if what has been urged be allowed, and no more need be said on the subject but this : That the human being who wilfully and deliberately fails in the object of his creation—for example, by self-indulgence in sensuality —falls below the level of the animal being which truly and loyally and honestly fulfils his object : and that, though by a figure of speech we call animals lazy, vicious, vain, or gluttonous, it is no figure of speech, but a most true verity to affirm of a sinful man that he is worse, incalculably worse than a beast, who indulges in sloth, or in pride, or in swinish excess.

IV.

Anecdotes relating to the sin of gluttony in mediæval writers not unnaturally own a monastic origin or assume a conventual character.

Take one in the light of a parable—a parable which perhaps contains more truth than some may be disposed to admit.

It is related of a nun, walking in the garden of her convent, that her eyes fell on a lettuce, and that she was tempted to the sin of gluttony. She yielded to the sin, plucked the lettuce, and ate it greedily. But she yielded fatally; for as she was eating, a devil entered into her, and she became possessed, with torments. Help was procured from a neighbouring abbot, who was sent for to exorcise the fiend: and as soon as the holy man entered the garden, and before he was exorcised in the holy Name, the fiend began to cry out, by the mouth of his victim: "What have I done, what have I done, that I am to be cast forth? I was resting quietly on a lettuce, and she came and greedily swallowed me up, and I have taken possession of her."

A worse fate happened to a monk who gave up himself to the sin of gluttony. This hapless man lived in a monastery of Lycaonia, and was held in great esteem and veneration by all his brethren for his apparently

godly life, and for the manner in which he performed all his outward duties. But the unhappy monk was a slave to gluttony; so that, whilst others fasted, he took secret opportunities for eating. At length he was overtaken with a serious illness which proved to be his last. As the hour of his departure drew near, the monks flocked around his bed, thinking to hear and behold at the death of so holy a man something for their soul's edification. What they did hear was this: "Brethren," said the dying man, "when you fasted, I feasted in secret: for which cause I am given over to the infernal enemy, who has already coiled himself around my feet and knees, and is now reaching my heart." With these words he expired.

A saintly old monk, while sitting at table with other monks, was favoured by GOD with an inward vision, in which it was revealed to him that some of his brethren were eating sweet honey, others were eating plain bread, and others, again, were eating uncleanness. Astonished at the vision, as he was well aware that the same provision had been provided for all, he besought GOD to enlighten him as to its meaning. The Good LORD answered his prayer and told him, that those who were eating in fear of transgressing against temperance, and hence had their minds uplifted to GOD, and joined prayer with eating, were they who fed on honey. Those

who merely were taking their meal with thankfulness, and acknowledged their food as GOD'S gift, without any special remembrance of the Giver of it, were they who fed on bread. Those who were eating for the sake of eating only, who gave up themselves to the sensual gratification and could think of nothing but their food, were they who fed on uncleanness. The vision set forth the divers effects of the same needful act of eating upon divers characters, according to the end and intention which each one set before himself. To those who were eating for a holy purpose, the support of our mortal frames for the glory of GOD, their nourishment was as bread and honey: while to the souls of those who were eating for the unworthy end of satisfying the palate only, their food was turned into uncleanness, defiling them with many faults. "If then," continues the author quoted, "we wish our food to be profitable to the body without prejudice to the soul, let us set before ourselves a right intention, and perform this lower action of our bodies without eagerness, and with an inward renouncement of all gratification."

V.

The sin of gluttony, when considered in the practical details of every-day life, is not altogether so well suited for minute analysis as some of the deadly sins which

have been discussed from this place. I purpose, therefore, to adopt a plan different in this case from the plan adopted in former cases. I shall not enter into minute detail. In the lieu of such detail, gathered either from experience in myself, or from observation of others, I am content to quote from the teaching, and thus to be sheltered under the authority, of a Saint, Bishop and Doctor of the Church. What has been already laid before you, indeed, on the other capital sins, has also been collected from masters of the spiritual life: and hence comes any value which may attach to such collected thoughts. But hitherto, the estimates or examples have been sometimes altered or re-arranged, have been sometimes enlarged or contracted, and have been always adapted to the necessities of modern life. Now, however, I propose to quote the Saint's analysis of the sin, somewhat developed indeed, but almost in his very words. There will be benefit to all concerned in such a treatment of such a sin. I shall speak with authority. You will assent without question. And both of us will be edified by the systematic and exhaustive, and withal the devout and scriptural estimate of the sin of gluttony, which an ancient Father has handed down to us as the teaching of the Church of his day on a matter of morals.

The analysis of the sin of gluttony by S. Gregory the

Great, is concerned with one feature alone of this two-fold sin. The Saint confines his attention to the popular meaning of the term, as equivalent to viciousness in the use of food. He also treats the vice as a personal sin, as distinct from a sin against society. And he does not descend into particulars, in regard to gross or vulgar excess. Thus, the Saint's method harmonises excellently well with our own plan, and with the requirements of the present day, specially with a view to the circumstances of those to whom I speak, and to the times in which we live. To this prefatory statement, I need only call to mind two points of which we must not lose sight. First: That the sin of gluttony consists in an inordinate and selfish desire for the sensual pleasure which arises from the gratification of taking food, when such desire developes into action. Secondly: That the parable of Dives and Lazarus teaches us that he, who in hell-fire lifted up his eyes being in torment, was a certain rich man who fared sumptuously every day.

We are tempted to the sin of gluttony, says the Saint and Doctor, in five different ways: and these five temptations oppose five distinct hindrances to our spiritual perfection. We will take them in order, and nearly in the language of the Father.

I. We are tempted to gluttony when, for the mere

purpose of gratifying our palate, we anticipate the time of eating, by forestalling our regular hour for meals.

This is our first temptation: and you will observe that it has reference to time.

II. Without anticipating the time of eating, we may be tempted to sin in regard to the quality of our food, when we seek delicacies wherewith to pamper, what the ascetic bishop well calls, this vile sense of taste.

Quality, you will perceive, is the leading feature of the second temptation to gluttony.

III. It may further happen, that although we be content with ordinary food, and so escape the second temptation; and although we fail to anticipate the hour of our meals, and so escape the first; yet, we may fall into a third temptation. And the third incentive to gluttony, to use the Saint's words, consists in seeking after sauces and seasonings for the sensual enjoyment of the palate.

In this case, stimulants to the appetite is the third note or mark of spiritual hindrance.

IV. We may, by GOD'S help, be free from these three temptations only to fall, by the malice of our bitter foe, into a fourth. We may avoid condiments; we may be indifferent to quality; we may be punctual in time: but if we exceed in the amount of food which we consume, so as to partake of common dishes beyond

what nature demands, we succumb to the fourth temptation of this capital sin.

Here the main point, in this fourth temptation to gluttony, consists in quantity.

V. Lastly, even if we avoid all the former means of sinfulness in the matter of eating, we may still offend against the opposite virtue of temperance, by partaking necessary food with too much eagerness.

The last note of gluttony, therefore, is marked by the mode or method of eating: and adds the holy bishop, this last fault is worse than all the others, as it is a clearer sign of our attachment to the sensual pleasure which eating affords to our natural appetite.

Hence, according to this great master of spirituality, we may become guilty of the sin of gluttony in five different ways, each of which possesses its own distinctive character, each of which may be recalled to mind by a single word. 1. We may sin in the matter of *time*. 2. We may sin on a question of *quality*. 3. We may sin by the use of *stimulants*. 4. We may sin in relation to *quantity*. And 5. we may sin, lastly, from eating with undue *eagerness*.

Having thus enumerated the five evil inclinations which tempt us to pamper the sense of taste, the good bishop appeals to Holy Scripture to enforce his analysis

of the sin, and to afford illustration of its practical working. It will be well for us to note these scriptural instances, not only as to their details, that they may be avoided; but also, as to the punishments which severally ensued to the guilty, either by the just judgment of Almighty GOD or by the sentence of man.

1. With regard to the temptation of anticipating the hour of our meals, S. Gregory brings forward the example of Jonathan, the son of Saul. On the day on which the Israelites smote the Philistines from Michmash to Aijalon, and were much distressed and very faint for want of sustenance, King Saul adjured the people saying: "Cursed be the man that eateth any food until the evening." But Jonathan, we read, "heard not [or perhaps, heeded not] when his father charged the people with an oath. Wherefore he tasted a little of the wild honey of the wood." No doubt in consequence, his eyes were enlightened. But what was the immediate and supernatural result of this disobedience? GOD "answered not" unto Saul "that day" when he would take counsel of Him whether or not he should "go down after the Philistines;" whether or not GOD would "deliver them into the hand of Israel." And when the cause of this mysterious silence was sought by lot, and the lot pointed to Saul and Jonathan as guilty, the latter

made confession of his sin, and said: "I did but taste a little honey, and lo, I must die." Whilst, although the sentence was afterwards reversed by the democratic will of the people, even under so absolute a monarchy as that of Israel; yet of his own son, and for this act of implied gluttony, did Saul say: "GOD do so and more also, for thou shalt surely die, Jonathan."

Jonathan's case may be considered as a warning against the capital sin of gluttony in the matter of time.

2. In order to deter us from daintiness in the selection of food, the Saint next instances the gluttony of the children of Israel in the wilderness, when they murmured against Moses and Aaron. "Would to GOD (they said) we had died in the land of Egypt, when we sat by the flesh-pots and did eat bread to the full." And also, when they "wept again and said: 'Who shall give us flesh to eat? We remember the fish which we did eat in Egypt freely; the cucumbers and the melons, and the leeks and the onions and the garlic,'" which appear to have been luxuries to them. But now, they complain, "our soul is dried away; there is nothing at all besides this manna before our eyes." And how did GOD punish His rebellious and discontented, though much-loved

people? GOD "rained flesh upon them as thick as dust: and feathered fowls like as the sand of the sea. . . . So they did eat and were well filled: for He gave them their own desire; they were not disappointed of their lust." But we read a commentary upon their conduct five hundred years later, in their recorded punishment. For "while the meat was yet in their mouths, the heavy wrath of GOD came upon them, and slew the wealthiest of them; yea, and smote down the chosen men that were in Israel." Or, as it is elsewhere said: "The LORD smote the people with a very great plague."

The conduct of the Israelites furnishes an example of the sin of gluttony in the question of the quality of food.

3. The holy bishop calls to mind the sin of the sons of Eli, the high-priest, as an illustration of the third temptation to gluttony, namely, in the superfluous seasoning of food. "The sin of these young men was very great," says holy Scripture: "for they made the offering of GOD to be abhorred." And why, or how? They appear to have been guilty in two ways. They not only desired to secure for themselves more than their legal share of the sacrificial flesh, or sought it before they were entitled to claim their allotted portion: but, they also forcibly took posses-

sion of the meat, in order that it might be cooked to suit their palate after one fashion, rather than after another. These may seem to some of us to be comparatively light faults, and hardly worth the place which is assigned to them in the sacred drama. And no doubt they were coupled in these young men with other sins which were more heinous. Yet, what does Inspiration declare concerning them? "The sons of Eli were sons of Belial; they knew not the LORD." What was the punishment with which GOD both at the time threatened them, and afterwards actually fulfilled? "This shall be a sign unto thee," said GOD to Eli, "that shall come upon thy two sons, Hophni and Phinehas: in one day they shall die both of them." "And it was so." For, not long after, when "the Philistines fought, and Israel was smitten, and they fled every man into his tent," that "the two sons of Eli were slain."

The fate of the sons of Eli should make us hesitate to sin by gluttony in the use of stimulants.

4. On excess in the quantity of food as a temptation to gluttony, are quoted the words of the prophet Ezekiel against the guilty city of Sodom. Apparently, no fewer than three of the deadly sins were justly chargeable against the self-doomed inhabitants, one in each of the three classes of sin, the result of im-

perfect love. They were guilty of pride, caused by love distorted; of sloth, caused by love defective; of gluttony, caused by love excessive. Behold, saith GOD, by the mouth of His prophet: "Behold, this was the iniquity of thy sister Sodom . . . fulness of bread . . . in her and in her daughters: . . . therefore I took them away as I saw good." And how did it seem good unto the Good LORD to take them away? The words "brimstone and fire from the LORD out of heaven," sufficiently indicate the punishment inflicted on Sodom for its sin of gluttony, as exhibited in undue excess, or in scriptural language, "fulness of bread."

The guilty cities of the plain teach us a lesson, perhaps unexpected, in the capital sin we are discussing, in relation to quantity.

5. As a warning against over eagerness in eating even coarse and common food, the Saint adduces the case of Esau, whose greediness in partaking of "bread and pottage of lentiles" is apparent, from his having sold his birthright for so mean a price. Thus, saith the SPIRIT of GOD, in the calm, dispassionate terms of sacred history when recording the sin of man, "thus Esau despised his birthright." And how was this form of gluttony punished? Eighteen centuries after the event, we have this inspired comment on

the conduct of Esau, which reveals his punishment, till then unknown to the world. Of the "profane person . . . who, for a morsel of meat sold his birthright," we learn that "he found no place for repentance, though he sought it carefully, with tears."

Esau's greediness thus stands as a monument preserved by GOD, to teach us to avoid that form of the sin of gluttony which arises from eating with undue eagerness.

These five species of the sin of gluttony, which, as I have said, may be remembered by as many single words—time, quality, stimulants, quantity, and eagerness—may be reduced, as a commentator on the Saint's words has pointed out, to two generic heads. The vice may be reduced

1. To a search after the indulgence of the palate; and

2. To the pleasure which ensues from the act of eating.

A little consideration will show the truth of this arrangement. Why, urges the writer in question, why is it an imperfection to forestall the hour of our meals, but that this argues an impatience to indulge our palate? Why is it blameworthy to search after

costly dishes and savoury sauces, except that such misapplied industry comes from a desire to give pleasure to the taste? Why is it sinful to eat to excess? Because it is a sign that we eat not from necessity, but for indulgence. And the same may be said when we allow ourselves to consume our necessary food with too much eagerness.

VI.

To this examination of the sin of gluttony by S. Gregory the Great, two remarks only need be added, with which I will conclude:

1. There is nothing sinful in the fact of feeling gratification in the act of eating. It is equally innocent with feeling satisfaction or enjoyment in hearing good music, GOD'S work in science, or in gazing at a beautiful view, GOD'S work in nature. The feeling is a natural sensation, and therefore cannot be evil, because it was implanted in us by the Good LORD. The sin of gluttony consists not in feeling pleasure when we eat, but in eating that we may feel pleasure.

2. Neither is it in itself sinful to partake at certain times, and under certain conditions, of delicacies in food. If we never ate other than the plainest and simplest fare, there would be no opportunity, on the

one hand, for exercising self-denial when the Church commands us to abstain, or, on the other hand, of feasting when the Church bids us to rejoice. It is not in the luxuries of food that Satan alone, or that Satan chiefly tempts us. Adam fell by eating an apple: and our Divine Master was tempted to satisfy His human hunger with bread. In this case, also, the sin lies, not in the mere gratification of the palate, but in the search after such sensual gratification.

A. M. D. G.

LECTURE TEN.

OF THE DEADLY SIN OF LUST:

THE THIRD SIN OF LOVE EXCESSIVE.

"*Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.*" S. MATTHEW, v. 8.

I.

THE Virtue of Chastity, the opposite of the last of the deadly sins, takes its title, according to S. Thomas, from the Latin word to chasten, or chastise. Whatever we may think of this negative derivation from a critical point of view, there can be no doubt of the value of the thought in a devotional aspect. For even as a perverse child, says the Angelic Doctor, requires to be chastened lest he fall into wickedness; so does our lust stand in need of chastisement lest it be drawn away into excess. And the virtue of chastity is the virtue which holds in check the sensual appetite, even if it does not ultimately conquer it. In other words, the last of the seven

capital sins, namely, Impurity, the sin which is the opposite of Chastity, may be defined to be the inordinate love of and desire for that form of selfishness which is called sensuality.

II.

The virtue of chastity and the sin of impurity are subjects which can only be treated from this place with difficulty, if not with danger. But, however dangerous or difficult it may be to discuss these matters in public, the difficulty is enhanced and the danger is intensified when they are discussed in private. In either case, the difficulty or danger to a large extent is due to the conventional unrealities of a false and hollow civilization. They result, not from the world's estimate of the seventh deadly sin being exaggerated, for the opposite is unhappily and notoriously the case; but from the estimate which society forms of sin in the abstract, and of the first six capital sins in the concrete—an estimate which falls short of the truth. They result, not because the world realises the heinousness of the sin of impurity; but because society inadequately appreciates the effects of other sins, such as avarice, or sloth, or envy, or anger, or even pride.

Nothing so fatally deadens the moral perception of

the evil of sin, as familiarity with wickedness under any form, in thought or word—nothing, that is to say, short of sinfulness in action. The open and undisguised way in which persons allow themselves to speak of sin, and the unguarded attitude they mentally assume towards sins upon which the world has placed no social stigma that ensures silence, creates such deadness. And the Nemesis of Virtue haunts these rash and unguarded persons. For the age which condones six of the deadly sins is the victim, perhaps to an unparalleled extent, of the seventh. Indeed, with regard to the sin of impurity society is inconsistent to its core. It is in part prudish, in part licentious. It tolerates the sin it will not speak of; and commits the sin which may not be denounced. For instance: Society is patient of the journalist, upon whose daily records of vice, in the needlessly detailed reports of the law-courts, in cases of drunkenness, extortion, murder, slander, theft, and violence it dwells. It is only impatient with the minister of religion, when he would exhort, rebuke, persuade, condemn, with scriptural impartiality all violations of the holy law of GOD. The result is two-fold. As surely as the natural nerves become blunted by repeated infliction of physical suffering; so does the supernatural instinct become callous by familiarity with outward

forms of wickedness. And the public conscience, hardened by contact with six of the capital sins, becomes an easy prey to the seventh and most deadly. Topics which a priest may not treat, and which bishops declare are unfit for sacramental confession even in penitentiaries, become, with either public or private approval, the subject-matter of platform speeches, the point of interest in questionable leading-articles or reviews, the staple of the novelist's prostituted talent, the unwholesome seasoning of letter-writing, conversation, and social gossip.

It has been said, that the danger or difficulty of discussing chastity or its opposite arises, to a large extent, from conventional unreality. But it does not arise from this cause alone. The natural law which governs the relation between outward objects and inner sensations is fulfilled in this case as in the case of others. The sense of sight, of taste, or of hearing may be the innocent cause of the sin of avarice, of gluttony, or of anger. It is equally true, neither more nor less, in the case which we are considering, the case of impurity. Over and above the temptations afforded by the others, a fourth of the five human senses—namely, the sense of feeling—may be the cause of the last of the seven deadly sins—namely, the sin of luxury. The connexion between the

senses without and the affections within is beyond a question. Yet are they not more keen, nor more harmful, in the latter case than in the former instances. When, therefore, the world would have us to surcease from warning men and women against the deadly effect of passion, gluttony, or covetousness, because the warning—by the very fact of warning—may be productive of the evil against which it is directed; then, and then only may the Church, on the like ground, abstain from warning men and women against the deadly issue of a want of holy chastity.

But there is a further consideration, independent of the inconsistencies of modern society, at which it will be wise to glance, though only to glance. Man was created, both in his higher organisation and also as to his lower sensibilities, by GOD, the All-pure. Hence, so long as man fulfils only the object and intention of his creation, under GOD'S law, and in obedience to his natural senses, he can never act the part of one who is wanting in perfection. For instance: Take the senses which are the most nearly allied to certain of the deadly sins. A man may see that which belongs to another, without being guilty of covetousness. He may hear words of contumely or insult, without giving way to anger.

He may sustain his bodily frame by sustenance, and not fall into the sin of gluttony. Nor is it otherwise with the remaining senses, and specially with that function of the sense of feeling which, indulged, may result in sensuality. One object of man's creation—and it was no mean object—was the re-production, by sacramental oneness with another, of a third in his own image and after his likeness, to the greater glory of GOD. Of course, I speak of the new creation, under the extension of the Divine Incarnation by sacramental agencies, which was anticipated even before the elder dispensation. And this instinct of re-production, implanted in all animated nature, becomes a rational sentiment in man, as the earthly means of creating saints for glory, and multiplying objects of union between the Creator and the creature.

Moreover, this sentiment implanted in mankind, finds a counterpart in the divine will; and in its fulfilment causes us to become living types of the Holy TRINITY. For all, whether or not they personally fulfil and extend the law of reproduction, are themselves the subjects of the divine law. Each one, as child of father and mother, is a member of a developed earthly triad which adumbrates not indistinctly the mystery of the ONE IN THREE. And the Divine Nature itself, in an ineffable manner, is

obedient to the almost universal law of reproduction. For, though the conditions are different, and the conclusions are not the same, there never was a time when relationships between FATHER, SON and PARACLETE have not existed in the Blessed TRINITY; there never has been a time when the Eternal SON was not begotten from the Everlasting FATHER, and the Divine COMFORTER did not proceed from Both.

Nor may we forget the influence of our theory about sin upon the position which love occupies in the economy of virtue and in the disorganisation of vice. GOD is Love: and in the fulfilment of His own divine law of self-existence, Love was manifested in the eternal filiation of the Second Person from the First, and in the perpetual procession of the Third Person from Both. Submission to the law of love in His creatures, is merely the repetition of the fulfilment by GOD Himself, is merely the fulfilment of one object of His creatures' existence: and hence, must be not only sinless but commendable. It is only when man disobeys the law of love, that he falls into the sin of impurity. It is only when he loves more than he ought to love some lower good in created things, in the domain of sensuality; it is only when he becomes an exceeder in love, by failing to love GOD as the Highest Good, that man disobeys the law of

chastity. And such excess of love becomes sin when indulged in thought, as well as in act; when consented to in trifles equally with matters of moment. For, we must never forget the feature in sin which was noted in the case of anger, and is even more true in the case of luxury, namely, that wilful wickedness in any degree is of the essence of wickedness of the worst form. Our Blessed LORD, with equal emphasis and the like particularity, has condemned the angry thought which leads to murder, and the unchaste desire which leads to adultery. He has taught us, that as murder is only anger in action; so sensuality is nothing short of the fearful sin of adultery in thought. And in one sense, the law of evil is more invariable with the sin of lust than with that of anger. For, in the case of anger, its expression may be one only of evil influence which need not exist in essence; but in the case of impurity, its development is a violation of inevitable law impressed upon our nature, a violation by excess. Hence it is, that I have ventured to define the last of the deadly sins as the inordinate love of and desire for that form of selfishness which is called sensuality.

III.

In treating the subject of the seventh deadly sin,

I shall again to some extent vary the method adopted in earlier lectures, and adhere to the method pursued in the last. I do not propose to draw a picture, however indefinite or vague, of one who is the slave of impurity, as I have attempted to depict the characteristics of those who may be guilty of pride, envy, or anger. I intend, also, as in the lecture on gluttony, to depend more upon the words of accepted spiritual writers, than upon my own knowledge and experience however gained. This, I repeat, will enable me to speak with more authority, and you to listen with greater patience. Moreover, I purpose to treat more of the virtue which is the opposite of the vice, than of the vice which destroys the virtue. Hence, we shall learn what to avoid by knowing what to cultivate. We may hope to advance towards perfection, therefore, under the influence of the law of progression through antagonism.

Spiritual writers distinguish between various kinds of chastity. There are at least four species of the virtue. I will name them in the order of perfection:

There is 1. virginal, or absolute chastity.

There is 2. conjugal, or sacramental chastity.

There is 3. The chastity of widows and widowers, which may be termed vidual.

There is 4. The chastity of repentance, which is penitential.

These four classes may be more exactly defined.

I. The first, or virginal chastity, belongs to those who, by GOD'S grace, and the care of their guardian Angel, have ever kept unblemished the spotless innocence imparted to them as infants at the font.

II. The second, or conjugal chastity, may be claimed by those who have entered the estate of holy matrimony; and in virtue of sacramental grace have kept their marriage vow inviolate.

III. The third is the continence of the widowed state; of those who are married, but whose sacramental union has been visibly intermitted in time, only to be again consummated in eternity.

IV. The fourth is the self-command of those who belong to none of the other three orders of chastity; of those who, as a matter of fact, have fallen into deadly sin; but who, after contrition, sacramental confession and absolution, are now living a godly life of penitential purity.

These several classes of chastity, to adopt the figurative language of the Fathers, have each a lustre proper to themselves, whereby they deck the garden of the Church. Of the first three, S. Ambrose writes thus: "Here you may behold the white lilies of virginity

which adorn it by their brightness. There the flowers of honourable widowhood which, though barren, are yet comely to the eye and embellish it with their beauty. In another part of GOD'S vineyard you may see the fertile harvests which fill with precious grain the storehouse of the Church—the vineyard, where the vines married to the elms produce abundant fruit for the SAVIOUR of mankind." Whilst in yet another part, it may be added, may be seen the sombre hues and mournful tints of those plants which have beautiful and delicate leaves indeed, but neither flower nor fruit. But even the penitential order of chastity find their own special place in the LORD'S garden, their own special grace of form and colour. They may be fairly typified by the foliage plant of luxuriant and devout repentance. Thus, continues the Saint, do all contribute, by the purity which is in harmony with their several orders, to embellish and enrich the garden of pure delight. And of these four classes, the first three may be called the positive forms, the last may be termed the negative form of the divine virtue of chastity.

Upon the negative, or penitential form of purity, I do not purpose to touch on the present occasion. But, to the three positive forms S. Jerome assigns, to each class severally, the excellencies which it may justly claim. Commenting on the Parable of the Sower

the Saint and Doctor of the Church gives to the chastity of widowed life the preference over that of wedlock; to the purity of the virgin state supremacy over both. The good ground on which the seed fell, and sprang up, and brought forth fruit, this the Saint explains to be the heart of the virtuous who yield fruit to the Church, each with a certain measure of variation. The thirty-fold is the spiritual fruitfulness of those who live chastely in the marriage state. The sixty-fold is the product of continent and blameless widowhood. But the hundred-fold springs from the heart of virgins, as being of all the purest and least defiled. To each degree of chastity, therefore, must be assigned its own special dignity and glory. The highest place is given to spotless virginity; the middle state, to pious widowhood; and the lowest position, to holy matrimony. Yet each class must be praised in subordination only to the special virtue of the other two. Thus, virginal integrity must not be commended so as to detract from the honour due to chaste widowhood; nor must the continence of widowhood be praised to the detriment of Christian marriage. Each estate of chastity possesses its own peculiar excellence and virtue, though all are not equal.

Here it is needful to make a qualification. Although

there exist various classes of chastity—as one star differeth from another star in glory—yet may salvation be attained under the influence of any one. Holy Scripture, both of the Old and New Testaments, seems to point to examples of each order in turn that all may have hope. The royal David and the saintly Magdalene are instances of penitential chastity. The patriarchs, some of the prophets, Joachim and Anna, are instances of chaste wedlock. Naomi and Judith, the prophetess Anna, and the great apostle S. Peter appear as preachers of continent widowhood. And Elisha, S. John the Baptist, the Virgin Mother of GOD, and the virgin disciple whom JESUS loved, afford practical lessons in the highest order of chastity, namely, that of pure virginity. All these saints of both dispensations, by the help of the queen of virtues, attained to bliss. And if the Vision of GOD is the promised reward of the pure in heart, of all the chaste without any qualification of outward estate, it is not becoming to compare those who have a higher gift of GOD with those who possess the lower, both being under the influence of the same divine grace. But still less seemly is it to compare the present position, or the future hopes, of those who have been kept from falling into sin—GOD'S grace alone marking the difference between them. Indeed, although it may be admitted in the abstract, and in

practice is undoubtedly true, that holy virginity is a higher state than conjugal purity or than pious widowhood; yet may a widowed or married person be more perfect and chaste than one who is unmarried. For such a one, teaches the Angelic Doctor, may be far more willing and ready in his mind to observe continence, if it were demanded by GOD'S service, than the other who actually possesses the treasure of virginity. In which case, the chastity of the married person will surpass that of the unwedded, in affection though not in effect. In such judgment S. Augustine concurs. Writing to a holy virgin the Bishop of Hippo bids her thus think with herself: "Though unmarried, I am not better than Abraham who lived in holy wedlock. For had it behoved Abraham to lead the life that I am leading, he would have led it with far more perfection: whilst had I to lead the life which he led, my perfection would fall far below that which he practised." In both cases, it is only a matter of divine grace, more or less active—a matter which may not be measured in the scales of a human balance.

Perfect chastity, then, is less concerned with the outward circumstances of its advocates than with their inward affections. With this opinion accords the estimate of the virtue, as taught by spiritual writers. They teach that chastity consists in the inward act of the

will; in the firm, determined and enduring resolve not to suffer anything that is not compatible with absolute purity: and that the outward relations of the bodily frame only incidentally affect the perfection, or imperfection of the state. This judgment is compatible with a belief in the higher condition of virginal purity when compared or contrasted with the chastity of widows, of the married, or of penitents. It is also supported by the incidental evidence of Holy Scripture. For whilst S. Paul individually considers the case of penitents, the married and widows, in his admonitions to chastity in their several cases; he yet broadly exhorts to purity in general terms as applicable, nay, as essential to all the faithful. And it is remarkable, or rather, it is only what might be expected, that the virtue of chastity is enforced by the Apostle in every one of his Epistles (with the exception of the Epistle to Philemon), be they addressed to corporate bodies or Churches, to individual bishops as chief pastors, or to Christians as private persons.

Thus, to state these Scriptural injunctions briefly, one by one: "This is the will of GOD," says the Apostle to the Thessalonians, and the context proves that the word is used of the virtue of chastity; "this is the will of GOD, even your sanctification." "Follow peace," he says in his Epistle to the Hebrew Christians; "and

holiness (or purity), without which no man shall see the LORD." "Keep thyself pure," is the charge of the Saint to his own son in the faith, Bishop Timothy. "Uncleanness," the Apostle writes to the Ephesian converts, "let it not be once named amongst you as becometh Saints." To the Philippians he urges, "Whatsoever things are pure . . . if there be any virtue, think of these things." "Having the promise of the Gospel, dearly beloved," he writes to the Church in Corinth, "let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit." To the Church of Rome, S. Paul the aged speaks "after the manner of men, because of the infirmity of the flesh:" and bids it "to yield its members servants to righteousness unto holiness." "Unto the pure," he declares to S. Titus, "all things are pure;" they preserve their purity under all conditions of life. "Walk in the spirit," he commands the Catholics of Galatia, "and ye shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh" —the first of which, the Apostle says, are sins against chastity. Such are examples of Biblical teaching; and the reason which ascetic writers assign for the repeated warnings of S. Paul to both sexes and under all circumstances, against violations of the law of purity, is the wide-spread calamities which the opposite vice entails upon mankind in this life, and the endless woe which it ensures in the next.

IV.

It is not easy to find in the pages of old devotional writers a story which it may be edifying to repeat to a mixed congregation, on the subject of the last of the deadly sins. But, in a treatise on the senses, I have found one which an author quotes as an instance of how displeasing to GOD is the incautious use of the sense of touch in this relation. It may well be repeated. The anecdote need not be taken as historical. I offer it as not unfit to be accepted as a warning against even apparently harmless familiarity—for the story relates to a religious devoted to continence.

A certain holy abbot was tried by GOD with a long and painful sickness, which deprived him of the use of his limbs, so that he was unable to turn on his side, or even to put forth a hand to take necessary food. After a year of so tedious an illness, he recovered sufficiently to enable his attendants to remove him from his bed, and to place him in a chair. Yet, even then, like a statue in a niche, he could move neither hand nor foot. Meanwhile, he received a visit from a neighbouring monk, William by name, a distinguished servant of GOD, who touched with pity at his helpless state, exhorted him to beseech the Almighty to restore him at least the use of his right hand, that he might employ it in some work. "No," answered the devout

abbot, "never will I ask for bodily health. I rejoice that GOD is pleased thus to try me in the crucible of infirmity, in order that being cleansed from all defilement, I may be worthy to be united to Him." The tender heart of brother William could no longer bear to see his friend in so sad a plight. He seized the abbot's helpless hand, blessed it, and healed it in the sight of all present.

Some days after, a kinswoman of the abbot, with all her family, came to visit him. The holy man, thinking that courtesy required it of him, caused himself to be carried in his chair to the monastery gate; in order that he might the more easily converse with her. While talking with his kinswoman, the abbot related the wonderful cure he had obtained of GOD, through the merits and intercession of brother William. On hearing this, the lady seized the abbot's restored hand and pressed it to her lips. Most persons would approve of such an act, as an act of piety or devotion. Few persons would see in it a shadow of evil. Yet, at this touch, at this kiss, the hand again became benumbed, and as helpless and devoid of life as stone. Of course, this event became known to brother William, who once more restored the useless member to power, after having duly warned the abbot against a liberty innocent in itself, which may be unseemly and is not without danger.

In order to keep unspotted this jewel of the supernatural state, the lives of the Saints are full of examples of the means which pure men and chaste women have taken to preserve it. These cases or some of them are collected in works of ascetic theology. Let me quote from one of them. If chastity be so precious a gem, so vast a treasure of sanctity—such is the devotional argument—what wonder that, rather than lose it, or even endanger it, the Saints have taken measures with themselves against temptation, which the world in this half-hearted, self-seeking age, would denounce as eccentric, if not extravagant? What wonder that the stern S. Benedict wandered naked among brambles, and crimsoned the thorns with his blood? That the self-denying S. Jerome was wont to smite his breast with hard stones? That the ascetic S. Francis of Assisi deliberately rolled himself in the snow on one of the coldest nights of a cold Italian winter? That the spiritual S. Bernard plunged boldly into a frozen pond? That S. Macarius walked barefoot amid briars; and S. Martinianus stood upon scorching embers? That an Egyptian solitary burnt the fingers of his hand, one by one, in the flame of a lamp; and a youth of noble birth gashed his face with a razor? What wonder, I say, that these and many others cruelly tormented their rebellious flesh to secure the gift which opens to

us the Vision of GOD, when we see the world braving even death itself to acquire honour, or power, or position, or place, or wealth?

Nor need these examples be confined to the case of men. Of course such cases are the more worthy of note, from the nature of the virtue as well as of the sex under consideration. But women have proved themselves not less jealous of their purity than saintly men under temptation. It is needless to do more than name some of the more illustrious maidens of Church history who, as virgins, have preserved their innocence —S. Agatha, S. Agnes, S. Cecilia, S. Geneviève, S. Lucy, S. Rose of Lima, S. Scholastica, S. Teresa: though if any desire details of other saintly women, they are not wanting. A native of Alexandria concealed herself for twelve years to escape the importunities of some high-born but dissolute youth. Another in the same city, was cast into a cauldron of boiling pitch for not accepting a proferred suit, when self-devoted to a Heavenly Bridegroom. A third, in order to preserve her innocence which was endangered, prayed that she might become repulsive before men. The LORD hearkened unto her prayer; and until the danger was overpast, she became the willing sufferer of a loathsome leprosy. Many others sought death rather than consent to sin. A whole convent of nuns

at Ptolemais, on the storming of the city by the Saracens, mutilated themselves, that they might escape a worse fate at the hands of the Mussulmans. These religious were given courage to disfigure their faces; and thus, bathed in their own blood, were slaughtered by the Saracens as victims of chastity. This fact is believed to be historical.

V.

An old Spanish theologian has written a treatise on the subject of chastity, which he has entitled, "The Triumph over Incontinency." The book is divided into three parts, which are headed respectively, the Incentives to Impurity, its Effects, and Antidotes. The subject-matter of these divisions, after the fashion of his day, and as a help to the memory, are reduced by the author, Drexelius, to doggrel verse. The antidotes to impurity are nine in number, and may be thus described in English:

"Books, prayers, stripes, confession, labours, fasting;
"Strict watch, CHRIST'S presence, torments everlasting."

The effects of impurity are six-fold:

"Fame, virtue, soul and body, wit and wealth,
"They blast, taint, kill, waste, dull, and take by stealth."

Whilst the incentives, named in the form of a warning, are seven in number:

"Sloth, meats, books, pictures, wandering eyes, words, mates,

"Fly, fast, change, avoid, close, shun, and shut the gates."

Of these three divisions, it is purposed to notice only the last, which naturally comes first in the treatise, and to annotate more or less briefly the seven-fold incentives to a breach of chastity.

1. The first of the allurements to impurity mentioned by Drexelius, is sloth. Nothing more surely than an idle life makes a man incline towards, and ultimately yield to this form of vice. This truth is avowed even by Pagan authors, by whom it has been well said that, "Lust is the business of those who are idle;" that, "To do nothing is to do evil;" that, "To be idle is to play the wanton:" heathen aphorisms which may fairly take the Christian shape of "Idleness is full of concupiscence." That sloth should become one of the enticements to impurity, is another proof of the inter-dependence of the seven deadly sins which has before been noticed. But as the sin of sloth was discussed under certain aspects in a former lecture, the subject need not now detain us longer.

2. The second allurement to incontinency is the sin of gluttony and of excess in drink. And here the same observation meets us, in regard to the mutual dependence between the capital sins and their relationship. The same fact has to be stated, that this enticement was treated under another form on a previous occasion. We will therefore be content to remember that, in support of this second position of our mediæval guide, we may quote the authority of Holy Scripture, and that from both the Testaments. The sin of Sodom, as we have before seen the prophet Ezekiel teaches us, had its source, not only in abundance of idleness, but in fulness of bread; that is to say, not only in the sin of sloth, but in the sin of gluttony. Again; the Israelites of old sat down to eat and drink at the idol sacrifices, and rose up to play. In other words, they were guilty first of excess at the idolatrous feasts, and then were lascivious in the impure games which ensued—a "play," in Scriptural language, so far from innocent as to end in a plague, which slew four-and-twenty thousand. And hence, S. Paul, who reminds the luxurious Corinthians also of this fact, bids his Ephesian converts not to be drunk with wine wherein is dissoluteness, or impurity.

3 and 4. The third and fourth allurements to a want of chastity, which Drexelius terms obscene books and

dishonest pictures, may be overpassed for the present. They both belong to a single class of temptations. One of them will be treated by and by.

5. This leads us to the fifth allurement to incontinency, wandering eyes. The mischief of lust, says our author, creeps not only through the single gates of man's body or mouth, or the double doors of his ears, but also through the double casements of his eyes. We want no further testimony of this truth than our own personal experience. Yet, the Scriptures give us both a warning of what to avoid, as well as an example which we may follow. The man after GOD'S own heart, as a penitent, once was guilty of two deadly sins, adultery and murder, under the malign influence of unwary eyes. David, walking in the cool of the evening on the top of his house, accidentally saw a beautiful woman washing herself. Such is the warning. Again; The man whose patience has become a proverb, and who was patient even with himself, the patriarch Job deliberately made a covenant with his eyes, that he would not think upon a maid. Such is the example. The sight ill-governed, say the Fathers, is a sign of a soul ill-managed. And our Divine Master's words are more than suggestive on this painful subject: "If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee."

6. "Evil communications corrupt good manners," writes the Apostle. Evil words are the sixth temptation to the sin of luxury which we must avoid. It matters little in what part of the body you receive a wound, so long as the wound is deadly. So, continues the Spaniard, "it imports not much, if thou shouldest perish, whether thou perish by the eye, or by the ear." The same lesson is taught us by an ancient. A heathen master observing two of his scholars talking together as they walked, enquired the subject of their converse. Which, when they had declared, the master commanded both to be severely beaten; the one for speaking, and the other for listening unto that which was impure. So, also, Inspiration: "All uncleanness, let it not be once named amongst you, as becometh saints."

7. The last of the incentives to incontinency is sinful companionship. The inevitable law of complicity in wickedness obtained even from the first. No sooner had our mother Eve sinned, than she made her husband a partner in her guilt. "Depart from the tents of these wicked men," was the command of Moses, in the case of Korah and his company, "lest ye be consumed in all their sins." The patriarch Joseph would not suffer so much as his bones to remain, permanently, among the heathen Egyptians.

Even the brave Peter, before he was made a Saint became a coward in the midst of the enemies of his LORD, and denied that he knew the MAN. So true it is, all the world over, that none can touch pitch and not be defiled therewith. None can associate with the impure and themselves remain chaste.

Thus have we shortly stated five of the seven allurements to the sin of lust, which Drexelius mentions—1. guilty companions, 2. evil communications, 3. wandering eyes, 4. over eating and drinking, and 5. bodily or mental sloth. 6. Books, or 7. pictures, with a tendency which is not pure complete the sevenfold incitement to the seventh capital sin. Literature and art are so closely allied, both in the genius which inspires them, and the sentiment to which they appeal, that they may be conveniently classed together in one division. But as books revolve in an infinitely larger circle than pictures; and as the causes of temptation are, as a fact, more widely diffused through the agency of the press than by the painter's brush, I propose to confine our thoughts in conclusion to immoral literature. And to this subject I earnestly beg your attention.

VI.

Immoral Literature may seem to be a subject hardly suitable for the thoughts of those who worship within

these walls. And yet, I venture to think, that a warning is needed for us, lest immoral literature become to us an allurement to incontinency. For, my Brethren, at the present day works of this class are not confined to the back alleys and side streets of our towns; are not sold only in penny numbers, or halfpenny tracts; do not circulate alone amongst the uneducated or little taught; do not appeal solely to the poor in this world's goods, or to the outwardly vicious and sinful. No. The immoral books of which I speak are read, I may say are devoured by the respectable classes, and by the well-to-do in the world. They attract the educated at the least, sometimes the intellectual. They are sold at a cost of from half-a-guinea to a guinea and a half. They are found in the studies of men of the middle classes and of the upper-ten-thousand, and in ladies' drawing-rooms. And so far from their being confined to the material slums of the city, they issue from every circulating library, even from those which are self-styled "select." And the name of the legion is Fiction. Modern novels are the form, which immoral, upper-class literature takes in our day. And fiction is the allurement to the deadly sin we are considering of which I would briefly speak.

It may not be without benefit that I should first quote a few words from the Spanish divine, to show

what was his mind on the subject. Books of this kind, he says, "are a very plague, an assured poison to the reader. And what is worse, you meet with it in every place, and find it scattered everywhere, not only in one language, but in many. For this shameless kind of writing many are branded with infamy. Some have composed histories; and others have written satires: some have sung poems and invented fables; and others have entered into another kind of writing in which, as well with true as with feigned narrations, they aim at nothing else but to poison the minds of their readers with the plague of impurity, by alluring them to unchaste thoughts if not to words, to impure desires if not to acts themselves."

Such words, written nearly three centuries ago, are not unsuitable to our times. But I would prefer to speak in the language of to-day; and rather by the lips of others than by my own. To this end, I shall quote the judgment of an anonymous writer, and mainly in his own words, who criticised novels from a literary and secular point of view, not from a religious standpoint, seven years ago in "Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine" ("Novels," September, 1867). English novels, says the writer in question, "have for a long time, from the days of Sir Walter Scott at least, held a very high reputation in the world, not so

much perhaps for what critics would call the highest development of art, as for a certain sanity, wholesomeness, and cleanness, unknown to other literature of the same class." The writer describes the good effect of this peculiarity, namely, that authors were placed on their honour, and readers were made unsuspicious and confiding. Our novels were, without disparagement, family reading; and our children could be amused equally with their elders.

Of late years, however, an obvious change has passed over our light literature. It is not that its power has failed, nor that its popularity has diminished—much the opposite. It is because a new impulse has been given to, a new course has been taken by, the flood of modern story-telling. Whence came this new style, it is needless to enquire: but society has accepted it, and it thrives. Perhaps it began about the time of the publication of "Jane Eyre" and "Shirley," by Currer Bell. But since then it has developed with intensity: and stories, the whole interest of which is concerned with sin against the seventh commandment, and revelations of things that lie below the surface of human life, are now mainly, if not solely popular. Such tales, the writer holds, might flow here and there from one morbid imagination, or from one school of novelists, without casting a stigma on society.

But this is not the law of their appearance. Their authors have almost monopolised the lower strata of light literature; and most of the more popular works are, in the worst sense of the word, sensational. Writers who possess no genius and little talent make up for the lack of both, by displaying their acquaintance, real or assumed, with the accessories and surroundings of vice. They devote the little mental power which they possess to an attempt to picture what they assume to be the master passion; to describe the inmost, over-ruling and all-powerful tendencies of the human heart—tendencies which, according to their own perverted imaginings, all point in one unclean direction.

It is impossible to follow this writer into even the few instances which he quotes. But to two facts he gives prominence which are worth quoting:

First: It is a peculiarity of these vile novels, that their authors are not of the sterner sex. On the contrary, their authors are generally women. It is to women that the world is indebted for these revelations of what even if true, and much more if false, had better remain untold. Women describe those sensuous raptures with which we are too familiar in novels of this class. This fleshly and un-lovely record is the pretended story of the feminine soul, whether

from the pen of man or woman, as it is said to exist under conventional coverings. This keen appreciation of flesh and blood, this eagerness in physical sensations, is represented as the natural and common sentiments of English girls and English women. It is offered to them not only as a portrait of their own state of mind, in which they may view themselves; but also as the photograph of others, in which they may find their daily amusement and mental food. Such a phenomenon might indeed exist, and yet society at large might be innocent. But

Secondly: Another fact has to be noticed, which makes the case much more serious. The class represented does not disown the portrait. It does not repudiate the likeness. On the contrary, it hangs up the picture in boudoir and drawing-room. The books which contain these mental analyses circulate everywhere, and are not even contradicted by the silent token of neglect. The subjects of the slander —for I would believe it to be a Satanic slander— make no obvious show of objection or dissent. Nay, they read unblushingly some of the worst specimens of these infamous novels. They calmly discuss their contents with neighbours of the other sex, at the dinner table or afternoon party. They criticise them with a frank impartiality and confidence, which one

can but charitably hope may be caused by guileless ignorance or by innocence undefiled.

Since the substance of these words were written in 1867, the evil which they deplore has increased both in degree and extent. To the two facts which the critic in "Blackwood" notices, namely, 1. that the authors of these noxious books are chiefly women; and 2. that society as a whole does not repudiate such estimates of itself, I will add a third from personal observation, as indicative of the morality of the age. It is this—that the writers of these infamous works are courted by the world; that persons otherwise blameless assent to such false hero-worship; and that the woman who, with considerable minuteness of detail, describes the scenes and incidents of the lowest class of immorality, and the life and pleasures of licentious men and impure women, is considered a seemly point of attraction in any common-place social gathering.

"Why do you read such a scandalous book?" was lately said to a lady. "How could I tell that it was scandalous until I had read it?" was the prompt reply. There was some truth, there was much deception in this answer, in regard to a certain bad novel. And it clearly points to a need. The censorship

of a venal press—and there is a venality of popularity as well as of money—of a press which, as a rule, is not more pure than the immoral fiction which it patronises, cannot be trusted. Even the leading Church newspaper, in the past year, patronised one of the very worst specimens of the novels of the current season, and commended its authoress. Hence, we must become our own censors. We must establish for novels our own private "Index Expurgatorius." And this must be the law for ourselves—never to read the works of any author whom we know to have been guilty in this way of the sin of impurity; never, unless assured beforehand that any given book contains nothing that is harmful. Nor need this domestic Index deprive us of that element of imaginative enjoyment which is as certainly wholesome in its proper place as it is natural. For a good novel is a great intellectual treat. The novels, however, which are the worst in impurity are, as a rule, the worst in style, and the worst also in taste. Their manner is as bad as their matter; and their grammar is as faulty as their morals are lax. We shall gain by our loss in exercising the self-restraint of not opening such bad books as these. And there yet will be left for innocent amusement and harmless recreation, the works of many authors in the first rank of fiction whose books

may be read without moral defilement, and with intelligent interest in the possible operations of the human mind and the probable course of human action.

Here then we may find a method of avoiding one of the seven incitements to impurity, to refer once more to the old Spaniard, in the matter of vicious books. We may abstain from reading them. And this self-denial in reading will not of course begin and end in the avoidance of bad novels. It will extend to all literature of doubtful edification in relation to the deadly sin of luxury. It will extend, especially, to the newspaper reports of cases in that moral blot upon English law, the godless divorce court, which, even if it be needful for the public weal to make known, it cannot be needful for private Catholics to defile themselves with.

VII.

Thus may we, according to S. Thomas, in one way and to a certain extent, chasten and chastise, even if we do not eventually conquer, that form of inordinate selfishness which we call sensuality, in the last of the deadly sins. Thus may we, even by such elementary and negative efforts, strive to lessen, according to Drexelius, the allurements to incontinency, by exercising its opposite, the virtue of chastity. We may

diminish the temptations to luxury; and by so doing we may increase our spiritual attraction to pureness and holiness of life. To recall once more the imagery of S. Ambrose from the garden of our Good LORD, we may severally cultivate one of the four developments of chastity towards which we are led, or by which we are influenced:

1. The sombre hues of the foliage-plants of devout penitence;

2. The produce of the fertile harvests of the vines and elms of holy matrimony;

3. The comely flowers and mellow tints of honourable widowhood; and

4. The pure white lilies of spotless virginity.

Thus may each one, in the state of life to which GOD has called him, seek after perfection by one of the greatest of GOD'S gifts, purity—purity of heart and mind, purity of will and intention, purity in act and deed. Thus may we purify ourselves even as He is pure, in confidence of the assured result; in confidence, that even here the pure in heart shall see GOD; in confidence, that hereafter the pure in deed shall enjoy the fulness of eternal bliss in the Beatific Vision of the All-pure.

A. M. D. G.

LECTURE ELEVEN.

FINAL QUESTIONS IN THE RELATIONS BETWEEN LOVE AND SELF AND SIN:

TITLE OF THE SINS; INORDINACY; DEADLY AND VENIAL SIN; CONCLUSION.

"*There is a sin unto death . . . and there is a sin not unto death.*" 1 S. JOHN, v. 16, 17.

I.

WITH the following pages, the present course of Lenten Lectures on the seven deadly sins, which has been extended beyond the usual limits, will be concluded.

There are certain final questions in the mutual relations between love and self and sin, which if explained will tend to make more evident certain positions which have been assumed, and to make less hard to be received certain difficulties which have been either overlooked or passed over. There are many of these to which I would willingly invite your attention. The time at our disposal will enable us to consider only

three of them, at greater or lesser length, on the present occasion. The last to be discussed is of absolute consequence. The first is of little moment. The middle question justly stands in a middle position. I will mention them in the inverse order of importance, but in the actual order of treatment.

I. The name or title under which the seven enemies of our soul have been analysed or examined, 'capital' or 'deadly' sins.

II. The employment of the adjective, 'inordinate,' which has been joined to the term 'selfish' in the several definitions of each of the seven deadly or capital sins.

III. The difference which exists between inordinate and selfish sins, which may be justly termed deadly, and those which, as a matter of fact, are only venial.

These three points, being more or less abstract in themselves, require to be discussed more or less argumentatively. Hence they will tax our patience and demand our attention. I venture to hope not in vain.

These three points having been treated, I shall consider our theory about sin to be stated with the fulness which circumstances permitted; and our Lenten work for the good of souls and the glory of GOD to be complete.

II.

I. The first point to which, in a few words, I desire to lead your thoughts is one to which, perhaps, it would have been better had they been led at the outset, rather than at the close of the present course of lectures. I mean the name or title of the sins which we have considered. They have been termed almost indifferently, mortal or deadly sins, and capital or root sins. Of these, on some grounds, the more fitting names for the seven enemies of man are the latter, capital sins; the less fitting are the former, mortal sins. For, from these seven issue as from either head or root all other sins to which men are liable theoretically, or into which they practically fall. They form the germ or basis from whence spring up or branch forth all that breaks the new commandment given by our Divine LORD, to love one another; all that violates the two-fold table of the new law, the love of GOD and of our neighbour. Hence, these developments of evil are conveniently and justly termed capital or root sins.

It is also, of course, strictly correct to call these seven sins, as the Church calls them, deadly. But they are the less fitted to bear this title in popular language, because it is sometimes found to mislead. To those who have not been trained from childhood in the

language of Catholic theology, the term 'deadly' is apt to prove confusing, and to produce doubts and scruples in minds free from such temptations. Without entering here into the difficult question of the notes or marks of deadly as distinct from venial sin, and thus anticipate our last point: and without trenching on our second point by an attempt to show under what conditions a given sin may pass from one phase of evil to another, the remembrance of three truths may prevent misapprehension in the use of the adjective 'deadly.'

1. A difference does exist between mortal and venial sin, not as a matter of speculation, but as a matter of fact; not as a casuistical problem, but as a dogmatic verity. Pagan moralists, Jewish writers, the Church Anglican, Roman and Oriental, and Holy Scripture concur in holding to the distinction. Moreover I will add, our own common sense, intellectual power, and Christian conscience teach the same truth, that all sin is not deadly, that some forms of sin are venial.

2. As there are differences in kind between various classes of sins, so are there differences of degree between various forms of the same sin. A passing feeling of nervous irritability is not of equal guilt with a deliberate act of murder; though both may be classified under the head of the deadly sin of anger. A passing feeling of covetousness, or desire for the possessions of another, is

not equal in wickedness to a planned and executed scheme for making such possessions one's own; though both may arise from the deadly sin of avarice. A passing feeling of lassitude, or want of energy for any given work, is not equally vicious with systematically neglecting one's duty towards GOD or man; though both may be assigned to the deadly sin of sloth. And the same law would apply to other sins which fall under the headship of imperfect love, whether distorted or in excess. It would apply even more definitely. For it may be affirmed, that the passing thought, even if not immediately disavowed and checked, is not of the like gravity with the sentiment deliberately harboured, the affection positively encouraged, or the thought consciously allowed to develope into action.

3. Sins not deadly in their germ may become deadly in their expansion. It may be difficult to trace the growth of sin, or its development, or its change, or its completion. It may be difficult to declare when and how sins from occasional become habitual, and from accidental become deliberate. It may be difficult to decide when and how sins of infirmity become sins of malice, or sins of ignorance become sins of presumption. But there is such a law of declension in wickedness. It is well that we should acknowledge the possibility of such declension, in order that we may

avoid it. It is well that our language should follow the experience of our actions. But as it is true that we may be angry and sin not; that we may be covetous and sin not; that we may be slothful and sin not—in each case after a deadly manner: so, it is true that we may fall into the faults indicated by these terms, and be guilty of mortal sin.

It were needless to state these truths were it not that they are denied, forgotten, or ignored by the indifferent, by the scrupulous, or by the wicked respectively. And it is for reasons which may be gathered from these truths that, whilst we do not deny that capital sins are or may become deadly, we hold it to be probably wiser, and certainly not less safe, to call the seven sins with which we have dealt capital, rather than mortal sins.

III.

II. It will not have escaped your observation, my Brethren, in each of the definitions which have been offered of the seven deadly sins, that the word 'inordinate' finds a place. It is to this adjective 'inordinate,' and to the feature 'inordinacy' in the characteristics of each of the seven capital affections of man's heart, that I desire in the next place to lead your thoughts.

One of the phenomena of our mortal frame which strikes all thoughtful persons, but which few thoughtful

persons attempt to explain, is the capacity of our bodily organs for suffering. That the organisation of our bodies by a Creator perfectly Good and Almighty should be made in the first instance capable of disorganisation, is in itself a mystery to which none can find an adequate solution. Observe; this question is distinct from the old and only not everlasting difficulty of the origin of the mystery of evil in GOD'S world, though it may be, and possibly is, connected with it. But it is certainly a difficulty to one who believes in an All-wise, All-loving All-merciful, All-powerful First Cause, to realize that our human frames are capable of, are subject to disease, decay, death. It is, of course, arguable that such capacity even for deterioration is but one further proof of the absolute perfection of our bodies. Whether or not this theory be admitted, the difficulty is one which meets us in the domains of physical science as well as on the borders of theology, and forces itself on our notice as a matter of everyday experience. It is a fact, think of it, postulate it, explain it away as we will.

Now the laws of our physical nature frequently point to laws in our moral nature, are suggestive of laws in our spiritual nature. Difficulties in the order of grace which faith declines to allow, are often parallel to, if not identical with anomalies in the order of nature;

which experience cannot fail to accept. There is strong similarity between the capacity of man's moral and superhuman nature for sinfulness, and the capacity of man's physical and earthly nature for disorganisation. This resemblance is marked in more than a single point. It often happens in the bodily frame, that disease is caused by no external influence, but only by the temporary or permanent imperfection of some given organ in the natural life. It is at the least conceivable also, that moral perfection may become impaired, not by the agency of the external world, but by some inherent defect in certain qualities or attributes, either temporary or permanent, in the life above nature. And, speaking without philosophical exactness, this is the idea which underlies the use of the adjective 'inordinate' in the definitions already given of the deadly sins. Sin, in relation to the seven-fold form which it assumes, may be treated as the product, not of any external agency, but of certain inward affections disorganized, or of a single affection inordinately exercised, in seven different ways.

The whole theory about sin which it has been my endeavour to elaborate is based upon this assumption. We have seen that each of the deadly sins owes its origin to the affection of love under various conditions

of distortion, or deficiency, or excess. This is only to state in other language, that love inordinately affected in these three different, if not antagonistic directions will result—to restate the sins in their three-fold division —in pride, envy, or anger; in sloth; or in covetousness, gluttony, or lust.

But, it must be further observed, that it requires this feature of inordinacy, amongst other elements, to make that actually sinful which otherwise has only a capacity for sinning. It is not all distortion of love, it is not all deficiency of love, it is not all excess of love, that is of the nature of sin. It is only when such excess, such deficiency, such distortion becomes inordinate that sin ensues. Here it may be remarked how strong is the likeness between sin against the law of morality and sin against the law of faith, between ungodliness and heresy; and this likeness may help us to realize the question before us. Moral wickedness, or sin consists, for the most part, in the exaggeration, inversion, or falling short of the contrary Christian virtue. Mental sin or heresy consists, for the most part, in over pressing, or perverting, or understating the opposite Catholic truth. In either case there is a general law which underlies both. Divine truth forms the basis of most, if not of all heresies. Natural instinct and power under-

lies the commission of most, if not of all the deadly sins. But in both cases inordinacy, under different forms respectively, alone is the test of guilt.

This law of the effect of inordinacy, is more easy to trace in the case of some, than in the case of others, of the deadly sins. Yet, may it be shown of envy, sloth, and gluttony—sins in each class very low in the scale of evil—that the natural affections or powers, when they fall short of inordinacy, fall short also of deadly sin. Take the sins one by one.

1. It is possible to conceive that envy may exist, envy on behalf of another for gifts denied to that other which are lavished on some third person; or envy for the reputation, work, or influence of some other which may attach elsewhere—in both cases for the glory of GOD and the good of souls—envy may exist without mortal sin. "Enviest thou for my sake?" said Moses to Joshua, without declaring such envy to be sinful; and even whilst intimating that GOD'S glory would be enhanced if man had more cause for envy. Hence, it would appear that so long as distorted love is not perverted to extremes; in other words, so long as envy is not indulged inordinately, the affection itself cannot necessarily be charged with the nature of sin.

2. Again: It is possible to conceive that the prin-

ciple of sloth might be beneficially exerted in temperaments decidedly the opposite of slothful. A character over energetic, rash, headstrong, impulsive, unreflecting, might be improved by an element of that deficiency of love which, when exaggerated, leads to sloth. And here, so long as sloth be not carried to extremes; in other words, so long as inordinate sloth be not indulged, the affection in itself does not necessarily partake of the nature of sin.

3. Once more: It is possible to conceive even that the principle of gluttony may be defended, when not carried to extremes. Indeed, we cannot doubt that th principle which is capable of exaggeration has its own due and lawful position in our bodily economy, when held in subordination to higher instincts. Otherwise, the human race could not be preserved in its integrity and perfection. Our Divine Master Himself felt the pangs of hunger, and was pleased to satisfy them. And here once more, so long as this form of excess of love, for the lower good of created things is restrained within bounds, so long as the principle of gluttony is not encouraged inordinately, in the affection itself there is no sin.

So might the remainder of the seven enemies of our soul, under the influence of inordinacy, be reviewed,

and in each case be shown to lack the nature of sin when kept under due control.

We can claim Apostolic injunction for a certain sort of anger, when exercised under given conditions, and coupled with specified cautions. When therefore these cautions are observed, and when these conditions are remembered, anger cannot have the nature of sin. "Be ye angry and sin not: let not the sun go down upon your wrath." Is it beyond probability that inordinacy might violate these safeguards and make that affection of distorted love sinful which before was sinless?

5. Again: We can point to Apostolic authority for a certain sort of covetousness, exercised upon stated objects and followed by given results—a certain sort of covetousness, therefore, which cannot be of the nature of sin. "Covet earnestly the best gifts; and yet show I unto you a more excellent way." Is it beyond a question that inordinacy might cause even the Apostle's moral directions to become, in their effects upon love in excess, sinful?

6. Again: There is a certain feeling of self-respect which, with a felicity of expression the world has well described by a figure of speech as 'proper pride,' and which, in the case of the first of the deadly sins, bears

further evidence of the theory under examination, namely, that there is a form of pride, unaffected by inordinacy which is not unallied to godliness.

7. And the last of the capital sins is of so mysterious a nature and is so intimately connected with sinless human love, and even with perfect love divine, that it is not impossible to conceive—though here I speak with the utmost caution—something that falls short of inordinacy in the affection which underlies luxury, to fall short also of positive deadly sin.

Thus it appears, that the seven capital sins, having their source and origin in an affection which is divine, may under certain conditions be exercised apart from guilt. It requires the element at least of exaggeration, or as we have termed it, of inordinacy, to make that sinful which is the product severally of distorted love, of deficient love, and of love that is excessive.

IV.

III. The consideration of inordinacy as affecting the issues of the capital sins naturally leads to a consideration which in part has been anticipated in the foregoing discussion. I allude to the question of the relation and difference respectively between mortal and

venial sin. This is a question which, at the present day, needs to be raised and needs to be answered.

It is a wide, almost boundless question. It is hard, almost insoluble. But there are limits within which its treatment may be confined. There are explanations which serve to lessen the difficulty, however involved may be the problem.

The relations which connect mortal and venial sin and the differences which sever mortal and venial sin, first of all, find their justification in the common consent of a common humanity. Man's Christian common sense tells him that, as a matter of fact, differences in guilt exist between great sins and little sins. Man's Christian common sense tells him that, as a matter of experience, the relations between them are such that little sins develope into great sins. It were needless to insist on such elementary positions, were it not that they are constantly denied in the interest of theological partisanship. Yet, talk even to a theological partisan calmly, as a friend and not as an opponent. Ask him if he really thinks that the guilt of the loss of temper is equal to that of the commission of murder; and he will say: "No." Talk to him reasonably, as a rational being. Ask him if he really does not hold that the sin of losing one's temper may eventually result in the sin of

murder ; and he will say: "Yes." And if the partisan thus make answer, in the negative and affirmative respectively, he virtually abandons his theological position, that there is no difference in guilt between venial sin and mortal sin. He accepts the position, that the former may lead to the latter.

The common consent of a common Christianity, then, affirms that certain affinities connect mortal and venial sins; asserts that certain diversities separate them. Evidence thus obtained is strengthened, so far as it may be strengthened, by secular or semi-religious testimony ; is confirmed and assured to us on the authority of the Church and the declaration of Inspiration. For instance: The devout and moral heathen of the pre-Christian age, and the ancient Jewish Rabbi of the pre-Christian Church, held to these positions, of course in different language both from each other and from the terms which we should employ. Both, however, speak decidedly, to the extent to which they are severally capable to bear witness. The Catholic Church, whether East or West, in her catechisms and confessions, as well as by the voice of orthodox divines, maintains the like propositions. The Church of England, in her Sixteenth Article, distinctly pledges herself to the distinction, by the employment of the theological term

'deadly sin' (*peccatum mortale*) in relation to baptism. Nor is Holy Scripture silent on the matter; though it is not my purpose to argue the question from Inspiration, but only to indicate its teaching.

For instance: Our Blessed LORD, at the conclusion of the Parable of the Unjust Steward, warned His disciples that "he that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much;" words which call to mind the saying of the Wise Man: "He that contemneth small things shall fall by little and little," and are, at the least suggestive of the truth that venial sin may develope into mortal. Again: That mortal and venial sin are not identical is more than suggested by the words of our Divine Master in His Sermon on the Mount, in which He speaks, incidentally, of the differences between various kinds of the sin of anger; that of several kinds of anger, one is in danger of the judgment, one is in danger of the council, and one is in danger of hell-fire. And whilst S. Paul dogmatically affirms of many heinous sins, that such as are guilty of them shall not enter the Kingdom of GOD; S. John declares with equal definiteness, that though "all unrighteousness is sin," yet "there is a sin which is *not* unto death."

In view, therefore, as may now be said, of the common

consent not only of Christendom but of mankind, of the moral instinct of the heathen world, of the tradition of the pre-Christian Church, and of the declarations both positive and negative of our Blessed LORD and His Apostles, was not the Church Catholic justified in declaring that a difference exists between little sins and great sins? Was not the National Church of England justified in the employment of the theological term 'deadly sin' in distinction to such sin after baptism as may be termed 'venial?' Was not Christian common sense, and the spiritualized Christian intellect and conscience justified in teaching that, under certain conditions, venial sin may develope, and will develope, into mortal sin? In each case there was more than justification.

Next: What meaning does the Church attach to the words respectively, 'venial' and 'mortal' sin? To answer this question at once in theological and popular terms requires attention and care. Of course, in the first place, sin itself is divided into original sin and actual sin. In speaking of the difference between mortal and venial sin, we have to deal only with sin that is actual, the act of a man, in its two-fold form, 1, of commission (in thought, word, or deed), or 2. of omission. Actual sin has been defined by S. Thomas to be "an

act deviating from what is ordered for the end of man, contrary to the rule of nature, of reason, or of eternal law." Now there are two ways in which such deviation, or such opposition, may take place. It may take place, firstly, as an act of aversion from the Creator. It may take place, secondly, as an act of conversion towards the creature. In both cases what theologians call 'loss'—loss ensues to the soul of man. In the first case, a stain is left upon the soul; and the loss can only be repaired by a fresh infusion of the grace of GOD: and to such sin is given the name of 'deadly.' In the second case, though loss has ensued, no stain has been left upon the soul; the loss may be repaired by an act of Divine grace which it has not destroyed: to such sin is given the name of 'venial.'

Into the question of the punishment due in either case, we need not enter further than to say, that it is proportioned to both kinds of sin. Of deadly sin, as an act of aversion from the Infinite and Eternal, itself bearing the same characteristics, the punishment due must be eternal and infinite. Of venial sin, as an act of conversion towards the creature, towards the temporal and finite, itself bearing the same characteristics, the punishment due is finite and temporal. But of the effect of sin after baptism: 1. We must hold generally to the

above definition, that in the act of deviation or opposition consists abstractedly the guilt of sin. 2. We must hold in particular, that in the act of aversion from the Creator consists the guilt of deadly sin; and in the act of conversion towards the creature consists the guilt of venial sin. Such is the theological distinction between venial sin and deadly sin: and rather than use my own words, to mark the distinction, I have quoted the substance of a definition given in an "Explanation of the XXXIX Articles" by one whose name will command respect, Bishop Forbes, of Brechin.

But it may prove helpful if an attempt be made to give a somewhat more popular definition of these two terms. By venial sin, in the language of a simple catechism, the Church would have us to understand that sin which does not kill the soul, yet is displeasing to GOD. It does not positively deprive us of grace, but it weakens grace within the soul; and though it is more easily pardoned than mortal sin, and does not need the sacrament of confession for its cleansing, yet its commission predisposes us to the commission of deadly sin. On the other hand, by deadly sin the Church would have us to understand that sin which does kill the soul, and is deserving of eternal punishment. It does deprive us of supernatural life, which is

the grace of GOD; and if committed after baptism, it does need for its cleansing the sacrament of confession. Without presuming to limit the power of GOD'S pardon for sin, or to confine His mercy to His own appointed means of bestowing it, we, Christian priests, can but simply affirm—however unpalatable be the assertion—that the only covenanted way of obtaining forgiveness of deadly sin in GOD'S Church, after baptism, is through the sacrament of confession. The only covenanted way: and it may be added, that the only sin which the faithful are bound to confess is that which is deadly.

The difference between mortal and venial sin may be illustrated by a comparison with physical ailments from which the body suffers. Grace and nature, here as elsewhere, appear under similar conditions. The theological difference may be compared with the natural difference which exists between diseases that are chronic and diseases that are organic—using both terms in their popular meaning. Chronic disease need not involve organic decay; does not necessarily end in death; though if neglected it may attack the source of physical life. Not otherwise is it with venial sin. Venial sin need not involve the actual loss of grace; does not necessarily end in the death of the soul; though if encouraged, it certainly will lead to the deprivation

of the supernatural life. In both cases, physical and spiritual, those who are careful of health are careful also to avoid that which tends towards the injury of health. A complete state of bodily health is prevented by the presence of the symptoms of chronic disease. Perfect purity of soul and absolute holiness of life are compromised by the infection even of venial sin.

Lectures which treat of the seven capital or root sins are avowedly concerned more with deadly than with venial sin. In the foregoing lectures there has been occasion to observe from time to time, or the truth was apparent without observation, of certain acts of sin, that though such sin theoretically falls under the headship of one of the deadly seven, yet, that the act practically does not necessarily involve the commission of mortal sin, or indeed the commission at all of sin. Hence it is well, before the conclusion of the present course, to endeavour to obtain a standard sufficiently exact to satisfy theoretic principles, and sufficiently elastic for practical purposes, to enable us to decide when we may fall into the one sort of sin, and when we may fall into the other. I approach the subject, however, with hesitation, for two reasons. It is almost impossible to offer a standard which may

be at once comprehensive, and yet not vague. It is altogether impossible to offer examples which may enable us to use the standard as a guide in daily life. There is the consequent danger of confusing persons with words when they are anxious about actions, and desirous to learn what degree of guilt may attach to any given sin. But the danger is inseparable from treating the capital sins from this place: and it is mitigated by the fact, that we have access to 'discreet and learned' priests, equally competent and willing to resolve cases of conscience brought before them. The difficulty, however, I would essay to meet thus:

Mortal sin, as it has been said, is that form of sin in which the soul of man is averted or turned from its Eternal, its Uncreated, its Incommunicable Good, which is GOD, by an act of deviation from or opposition to His law. This act, as a result, kills the soul; and as a punishment, it deserves eternal and infinite pain and loss. It produces this evil result in time, because the commission of deadly sin in a Christian, observe my Brethren, deprives him of the grace of GOD, which is the life of his soul. It deserves this dire fate in eternity, because the commission of deadly sin in a Christian, again observe, partakes of the character and attributes of Him against Whom it is committed.

Moreover the commission of deadly sin by a Christian is more absolute in its effect and more fearful in its punishment because in such a one it "crucifies afresh the SON of GOD, and puts Him to an open shame;" it "treads under foot the SON of GOD, and counts the Blood of the Covenant an unholy thing."

If this be accepted as a definition of deadly sin, and if such be its result and its fate, under what conditions, it may be asked, does committed wickedness become deadly sin? What is the standard at which venial sin rises in heinousness of guilt to the level of deadly sin? The answer to this question is two-fold: 1. Theologically speaking; the sin which, in an act of deviation from or opposition to the will of GOD, began by being a conversion only towards the creature and ends in aversion from the Creator; which began by GOD'S grace being obscured and ends by GOD'S grace being withdrawn—is a deadly sin. 2. Practically speaking; that sin is a deadly sin which is done under the joint influence of two distinct conditions: first, that the sin be a serious or grievous offence in the sight of GOD; and secondly, that the sin be done with perfect consent and sufficient knowledge. Both conditions are required in combination to constitute deadly sin. If either are wanting in the

commission, the sin does not fall under the stigma of mortal sin: it is a venial offence only. For example: If the sin be serious, and yet done without full consent; or if the sin done with full knowledge be not serious; in either case, the sin is venial only, it is not mortal. But, to repeat the definition combined with the conditions, every serious sin which is committed with sufficient knowledge and perfect consent is a deadly sin before GOD. It is a sin which by an act of deviation from and opposition to the Divine Will, places the soul of man in a posture of aversion from its Eternal, and Uncreated, and Incommunicable Good. It is a sin which not only obscures the grace of GOD, in the soul, but causes it to be withdrawn. It is a sin which kills the soul in this life, and deserves eternal punishment in the next. It is a deadly sin.

I do not purpose to enter further into this difficult question, than to recur for a brief space to the elementary example mentioned at the outset. I instanced the case of the capital sin of anger, and suggested that even a reasonable theological opponent, who in theory demurred to a difference between deadly and venial sin, would not affirm that the guilt of a sin of temper was of equal heinousness with the

guilt of the sin of murder; would not deny that the venial sin of temper might eventually develope into the mortal sin of murder. And this case furnishes a suitably clear example of the standard above stated. A mere sin of temper cannot be termed a serious or grievous offence against GOD, even if committed with perfect consent and sufficient knowledge. Much less if committed without consent or without knowledge can it be termed grievous or serious. It is therefore fitly named venial. But the sin of murder could hardly be termed otherwise than a serious or grievous offence against GOD, even if committed without perfect consent and full knowledge: whilst if committed with consent and with knowledge, it still more deserves the title of grievous or serious. It is justly named deadly.

Again: If we turn from practical conditions to a theoretic definition, we shall probably perceive, in view of our estimate of the capital sin of anger, that though the sin of temper may be described as an act of deviation from or opposition to the will of GOD, it is rather an act of conversion towards the creature than of aversion from the Creator. As such it only obscures grace; it does not cause grace to be withdrawn; and hence, only deserves finite and temporal punishment. It may be forgiven by an act of grace the opposite of

the sin, by one which falls short of a formal act of confession of sin to a priest. It is simply a venial offence. But in view of the same estimate of the capital sin of anger, the guilt of the sin of murder must be declared to consist in an aversion of the soul of man from GOD, being as it undoubtedly is a deviation and opposition between the human will and the Will Divine. As an act which places the soul in antagonism to its Eternal, Uncreated and Incommunicable Good, it causes the death of the soul by the withdrawal of grace in this life; and it deserves as a punishment in the next life eternal pain and loss. Such sin after baptism cannot be forgiven, in the covenanted scheme of salvation, without and apart from an act of confession of sin to a priest. It is worse than a venial offence. It is deadly sin.

These considerations, also, indirectly point to the truth not directly treated, that venial sin may lead, and if encouraged will lead, to sin that is deadly.

V.

It has been needful, from the form which the preceding lectures have taken, to dwell on man's sin almost to the exclusion of GOD'S love for man; to dwell on man's sin entirely apart from man's penitence and GOD'S absolution. Almost to the exclusion

of GOD'S love, I say—for ever and again we have had cause to remember that love is the antidote of self. Entirely apart from man's penitence—for contrition, confession of sin, and amendment of life, have not formed the subject-matter of our thoughts. At the end of this course of lectures I venture to adhere to the opinion expressed at the outset. I believe the principle to be sound on which they were projected, on which they have been developed. And though I neither say, nor think, that our time during Lent might not have been more profitably employed, yet, I am convinced that any loss of time which may have ensued is due to the manner and not to the matter of the lectures, to myself and not to my subject.

It is meet and right that, under certain conditions of time and place, we should endeavour to obtain a comprehensive view of sin, of sin as it exists theologically, of sin as it presents itself to us practically. To obtain this view is no easy task, even with suitable means at command. But it is worth while to make the effort, in regard to the benefit which attends any measure of success, and even a certain amount of failure. As a savage is surprised when he sees himself for the first time reflected in a looking-glass; as one of ourselves may be unconscious of our own per-

sonal appearance, when photographed from a point of sight which we cannot otherwise, or do not otherwise, obtain—so, I think, it is with sin. The truer, keener, more definite, more exact be the representation; the less usual the aspect which may be transferred to paper, of a sinner under the influence of any one of the deadly sins—the more forcibly will the picture come home to the observer, with a view to its conquest. And it matters not whether the spectator be a sinner who, by GOD'S grace, possesses the capacity of a saint; or one who has not fallen into the depicted sin, but yet may become sinful. Hence, of set purpose, I have sought to reproduce the sinner rather than to indicate the saint, rather, even, than to describe the penitent.

The plan adopted, I admit, devotionally is the lower plan. It is also the least attractive to the preacher, though it may not be the least useful to the hearer. It might have been more suitable for the priest to dwell on the covenanted means of counteracting sin by love; to urge the irresistible power of all-prevailing love over the only not unconquerable force of sin. But there are different modes of compassing the same end. The minister of GOD is bound to "reprove and rebuke," as well as privileged to "exhort with all love-suffering," And as a physician of souls, I have endeavoured, how-

ever inadequately, to probe the wound and to discover the symptoms, as a preliminary operation to pouring in the oil of sympathy and the wine of discipline. This last treatment for sin-sick souls it is both the duty and privilege of a confessor to administer. To the former end, as a preacher, I have devoted the time placed at our disposal for these Lenten lectures.

I now conclude. If the analysis of the seven deadly sins has taught some persons certain truths in the inner working of their souls, which before they knew not; if it has made others more familiar with certain features of sin in the soul, of which before they were only partially conscious; if it has solved some difficulties in regard to daily temptations and trials, though it has left many unexplained; if, finally, it has indirectly offered some suggestions for the conquest of sin in the facts of daily life, though many could not be given — then, a theory about sin which underlies the analysis, namely, that human selfishness is the source and origin of the deadly sins, will not have been stated in vain.

A. M. D. G.

THE END.

LONDON:
R. CLAY, SONS, AND TAYLOR, PRINTERS,
BREAD STREET HILL.

SELECTION OF WORKS EDITED BY THE

REV. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A.

RITUAL OF THE ALTAR: *The Office of Holy Communion, with Rubrical Directions, Private Prayers, and Ritual Music.* Price 5*s.*

GLOSSARY OF ECCLESIASTICAL TERMS. Price 18*s.*

ASCETIC LIBRARY: 1. *Mysteries of Calvary*, Price 3*s.* 6*d.*; 2. *Preparation for Death*; 3. *Holiness of Life*; 4. *Examination of Conscience.* Price 5*s.* each.

HYMNS AND VERSES: 1. *Lyra Eucharistica*; 2. *Lyra Messianica*; 3. *Lyra Mystica.* Price 10*s.* 6*d.* the set.

MANUALS OF DEVOTION FOR HOLY COMMUNION: 1. *Divine Liturgy* [for Sacramental Reception]; 2. *Daily Sacrifice* [for Spiritual Communion]. *For daily use.* Price 1*s.* each.

SELECTION OF WORKS EDITED BY THE

REV. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A.

SPIRITUAL READING: 1. *Meditations for a Month* and *the Seasons;* 2. Avrillon's *Readings on the Holy Spirit,* and *Meditations on the Holy Communion;* 3. Bourdaloue's *Spiritual Exercises for a Retreat;* 4. Luis of Granada's *Considerations on the Four Last Things.* Price from 1*s.* to 2*s.* 6*d.* each.

THE LITURGIES OF 1549 [1st Book of Edward VI.] AND 1662 [our own Office]: *Printed in parallel pages.* Price 1*s.* 6*d.*

SIX SHORT SERMONS ON SIN: *Lent Lectures. Price* 1*s.*

SECULAR JUDGMENTS IN SPIRITUAL MATTERS. Price 1*s.*

In preparation.

ALTAR WORSHIP: *A Manual of Holy Communion for Worship without Reception.* From Greek, Latin, and English sources.

BY THE SAME EDITOR.

STUDIES IN MODERN PROBLEMS.

In Two Volumes, Price 5*s.* each.

FIRST SERIES.

SACRAMENTAL CONFESSION. By A. H. WARD, B.A.

ABOLITION OF THE XXXIX. ARTICLES. Part I. *Their Zwinglian Origin.* By NICHOLAS POCOCK, M.A.

THE SANCTITY OF MARRIAGE. By J. W. LEA, B.A., F.G.S.

CREATION AND MODERN SCIENCE. By GEORGE GREENWOOD, M.A.

RETREATS FOR PERSONS LIVING IN THE WORLD. By T. T. CARTER, M.A.

CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT. By E. L. BLENKINSOPP, M.A.

THE BISHOPS ON CONFESSION IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A.

BY THE SAME EDITOR.

STUDIES IN MODERN PROBLEMS.

In Two Volumes, Price 5*s.* each.

SECOND SERIES.

SOME PRINCIPLES OF CHRISTIAN CEREMONIAL. By J. E. FIELD, M.A.

A LAYMAN'S VIEW OF CONFESSION OF SIN TO A PRIEST. Part I. *Scriptural and Ancient Authorities.* By J. D. CHAMBERS, M.A.

RESERVATION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT. By H. HUMBLE, M.A.

MISSIONS AND PREACHING ORDERS. By J. E. VAUX, M.A.

A LAYMAN'S VIEW OF CONFESSION OF SIN TO A PRIEST. Part II. *Anglican and Modern Practice.* By J. D CHAMBERS, M.A.

ABOLITION OF THE XXXIX. ARTICLES. Part II. *Their Calvinistic Adoption.* By NICHOLAS POCOCK, M.A.

THE FIRST LITURGY OF EDWARD VI. AND OUR OWN OFFICE. By ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A.

Rm 947 Pamph. 4/6
07/R

DATE DUE

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01014 6423